DOCUMENT NO. I

The Anti-Semites' Definition of Capital

LIEBERMANN VON SONNENBERG ON "USEFUL" AND "HARMFUL" CAPITAL*

We anti-Semites are opposed to neither Jewish capital nor to capital in general. We distinguish, however, between useful and harmful capital. We seek to promote the useful and to restrain the harmful. Useful capital, in our opinion, is that which is put to work in agriculture and in industry, where it creates livelihoods for millions of workers. Useful capital operates in honest trade the function of which is to collect the world's goods and offer them for sale everywhere thus enabling the whole of mankind to participate in the progress of civilization. Useful capital, we think, is present in the form of savings which represent the fruit of an industrious life. Useful capital increases on a modest scale only after real labor has been spent on increasing it.

But harmful capital grows beyond all limits without doing real work, setting the stage for frauds and swindles that rob trusting people. Such capital may be found at the stock exchanges, and it is certainly no fault of *ours* that this capital is mostly in Jewish hands.

* *Reichstag, Stenographische Berichte,* December 7, 1893, p. 322.

DOCUMENT NO. II

Adolf Stoecker's First Anti-Semitic Speech:

"WHAT WE DEMAND OF MODERN JEWRY"*

For a long time the Jewish problem has been a burning question, but in the last few months it has burst out into an open conflagration. It is not fed by religious fanaticism nor by political passion. The orthodox and the freethinkers, conservatives and liberals, all talk and write about it with the same vehemence. All alike consider the Jewish problem not a question of contending religious beliefs but a disturbing social problem. "The social problem is the Jewish problem," writes Glagau. "Don't vote for a Jew!" exclaims W. Marr, in his third pamphlet. "The end of Germany has come," he concludes his passionate appeal to our people.

Well, we do not believe the end of the German spirit to be so near. Peoples as well as individuals can be reborn. Germany, and Berlin too, will recover and rid themselves of the foreign spirit. But there are symptoms of the presence of a disease: our national body is plagued by social abuses, and social hostility never exists without reason. Christians as well as Jews should be seriously concerned lest this enmity turn into hatred. For the rumbling of a far-off thunderstorm can already be heard. It is strange indeed that the Jewish liberal press does not have the courage to answer the charges of its attackers. Usually it invents a scandal, even if there is none. It sharpens its poisonous pen by writing about the sermons in our churches and the discussions in our church meetings; but it hushes up the Jewish question and does everything to prevent its readers from hearing even a whisper from these unpleasant voices. It pretends to despise its enemies and to consider them unworthy of an answer. It would be better to learn from the enemy, to recognize one's own defects, and work together toward the social reconciliation which we need so badly. It is in this light that I intend to deal with the Jewish question, in the spirit of Christian love, but also with complete social truthfulness.

Occasional comments of mine on this topic at Christian Social meetings have been disseminated in the general public, often for partisan purposes, and always in distorted, exaggerated, poisoned form. The reporters of certain papers, a disgrace to this city of the intelligentsia, are as ignorant as they are

* Speech delivered at the Christian Social Workers' Party rally of September 19, 1879. Stoecker, Adolf: *Christlich-Sozial, Reden und Aufsätze, loc cit.*, pp. 143 ff.

untruthful. They misrepresent a great deal from ignorance, but mostly from sheer spite.

An incident which happened last year is quite instructive and typical. During my absence there was more talk about Jews in our meetings than there should have been. The Jewish press wrote that the Christian Social movement was filled with hatred of the Jews and itched to persecute them. When I returned, I took the opportunity to declare publicly and solemnly: We hate no one, not even the Jews; we respect them as our fellow citizens and love them as the people of the prophets and apostles that brought forth our Savior. But when Jewish papers assail our faith and the Jewish spirit of Mammon corrupts our nation, our love should not prevent us from pointing out this danger. This statement, too, has been distorted. I am supposed to have said that all Germany's misery has been brought about by the Jews. I was flooded with letters. A Berlin Jew whose name is known to me wrote that his people were God's favorites and when Christians professed their love for the chosen people, it was the same as when courtesans—I prefer to use this more decent expression—gave their hearts to noblemen. Another sent me a pamphlet in which an unbelieving baptized writer describes and exaggerates the role of the Jews in the field of medieval science. The dedication reads: "To the Jew-baiter, with contempt." A third one from Frankfurt am Main, who signs himself "Unfortunately a Jew," congratulated me on revealing the German plight so frankly.

This incident, insignificant in itself, is a clear example of the lies, the arrogance, and the hatred which confuse the issue as soon as the Jewish question comes up for discussion. People who are in the habit of pouring out the most biting criticism of State and Church, men and events, become highly incensed when anyone takes the liberty of directing even so much as a searching glance at Jewry. They themselves hatefully and sneeringly assail any non-Jewish endeavor. But as soon as a mild word of truth is uttered about them and their doings, they put on an act of injured innocence, of outraged tolerance, of being the martyrs of world history. Nevertheless I shall dare to speak up openly and candidly about modern Jewry tonight. And I am quite prepared for the distorted reports that will come back.

I do indeed consider modern Jewry a great danger to German national life. By this I mean neither the religion of the orthodox nor the enlightenment of the reformed. Orthodox Judaism, this ossification of the Law, the Old Testament without a temple, without priests, without sacrifice, without a Messiah, is neither attractive nor dangerous to the children of the nineteenth century. It is a form of religion which is dead at its very core, a low form of revelation, an outlived spirit, still venerable but set at nought by Christ and no longer holding any truth for the present. Reformed Judaism is of even less religious significance. It is neither Judaism nor Christianity, but a pitiful remnant of the age of enlightenment. Its ideas did not originate on Jewish soil but in a wretched period of the Christian church, a period long since overcome by the church itself. Both factions boast, of course, that the Jews are the bearers of the loftiest religious and moral ideals for mankind and the

world and that it is the mission of Jewry, now and in the future, to maintain those ideals, to develop and spread them. On this point the Jewish press, from right to left, stands united.

The incense which the Jews lavish on themselves in the synagogues of both schools is quite overpowering. When recently the centenary of the noble Moses Mendelssohn was celebrated, the solemn gathering was confronted with the slogan: "From Moses to Moses there is none to compare" (*Von Moses bis Moses ist niemand wie dieser*). The gracious personality of Moses Mendelssohn can hardly be said to have exercised an overwhelming influence on the development of mankind. Yet he is now being invoked in a peculiar way. At the commemoration of the anniversary of his death in 1870 the *Landesrabbiner* Dr. Adler uttered these glowing words: "The Jewish State has perished, but Jewry lives on and carries on its mission. Its existence is an important factor in the history of mankind, in the progressive culture of man. Our mission has been, is, and will be: the victory of the progressive spirit of man, the victory of humanity. Even the vanished Jewish State is not dead to us. What perished was only the shell of a life everlasting, of a people vested with a great mission of historic importance."

Here you see that mankind is actually only a pedestal for the imperishable tribe of the Jews. This is the way of almost all Israelites who meditate about their people. Philippson sees the great mission of Israel in the spreading of monotheism, in the exchange of international communication, in the achievement of religious equality and freedom. He writes as follows: "Struggle in every field assures Jewry a great future. This is true of professing Jews as well as for all mankind in its gropings. It is Judaism alone that in the midst of chaos offers thoughts and ideas which accord with the history of mankind, with reason and emotion." And in complete agreement with this notion the orthodox Israelite says: "The Jew is the incarnation of mankind. Any progress within mankind is progress for Israel; any discovery, any advance—they all take place, first of all, for the benefit of our people."

"It is Israel's mission," they say in the Jewish orthodox camp, "to bring salvation to the world, and the time is near, for the cross is disintegrating, the crescent is going down, and the pagan peoples of Asia and Africa no longer care for their traditional idols!"

"The day the temple was destroyed Messiah was born; on that day began Israel's enlightened progress as the savior of the world from delusion and error," Rabbi Levin preached naively in Nürnberg at the consecration of a synagogue, before Christian representatives of the town. Spreading his arms he cried out to the gathering: "This kiss to the whole world." That is going a little far.

S. Meyer, editor of the *Jüdische Presse* writes: "We cannot permit the indisputable fact to be challenged that Judaism is the source of all the lofty ideas on which the moral order of the world is based, which form the intellectual content even of modern culture and civilization and the basis of true charity." And again: "Nothing that is good in the Gospels is new, but stems from Judaism, and all that is new is not good."

Dr. Adler writes in a similar vein: "Israel's religion is the eternal inexor-

able truth; Christianity and Islam are preliminary stages which had to be attained before the whole truth could be revealed." The Reformed Rabbi Nascher joins the chorus: "It is Israel's mission and endowment to be a beacon on the sea of mankind's ideas. You are called upon," so this vain man told his vain listeners in a sermon, "to shine like the stars to your fellow men." Lest anyone believe these are exaggerations on the part of individuals, let him read the resolutions of the Augsburg synod of 1871 which state among other things: "The spirit of true awareness of the divine and of ethical purity more and more pervades the consciousness of the peoples. Jewry joyfully recognizes this as a step toward the goals which it has striven for throughout its historic development."

Here we wish to make our first request. We ask: *please, be a little more modest!* We do not deny that Israel carried the knowledge of the one and only God through ancient times like a sacred flame until Christ came and brought the more perfect faith, the richer conception of God, and the higher truth. But it is a historic fact that the people of Israel time and again relapsed into the grossest idolatry, that God was able to suppress apostasy for short periods only by sending outstanding personalities. It is God's grace rather than Israel's merit that the doctrine of the one God has been preserved for mankind. It is just as indubitable that the ideas of freedom of religion, of tolerance in the modern sense, do not fit into the character of the Old Testament. Whoever violated the sabbath was stoned; the priests of Baal were slaughtered. This was inherent in the Jewish legal institutions and we are far from blaming the Old Testament for it.

But it is quite out of order when Jews claim as their own ideas which were historically altogether unknown to their religion. And furthermore they are quite aware of the fact that they had a caste of priests—certainly the opposite of equality; that they had slavery—certainly the opposite of freedom; that they indulged in polygamy—certainly the opposite of ideal family life. Only Teutonic-Christian life put an end to these abuses. It is true, Israel had an enlightened economic legislation; social forms of property ownership, the prohibition of usury, and the greatest charity toward the poor. But we have only to mention these things to realize the fearful chasm between the Old Testament and modern Jewry. It was German law alone that protected the concept of common property, the Christian church alone that decreed the prohibition of usury; it is precisely here that the faults and sins of modern Jewry are plainly revealed.

Even if we presume for once that this lofty mission really is Israel's permanent task, who, then, are those thinkers and poets, who, inspired by the divine spirit, preach, praise and honor the living God? Perhaps the editors of the *Tageblatt*? Or the scholars of the *Kladderadatsch*? Where is the school of the prophets of the Holy Spirit which trains young men for their world mission? Where are the missionary posts? Where are the missionaries? Perhaps at the stock exchanges of Berlin, Vienna and Paris? Alas, the Jews should not be told such foolishness. For it is their ominous fate that, having failed Christ, they have lost their divine course, have abandoned their sublime mission. Confronted with the Lord's sharp-edged alternative: 'Thou canst not serve

both God and Mammon," they now worship the idol of gold, having forsaken the path of God.

The old prayers in which the Jews yearn for God and Zion are moving. "Because of our sins we have been driven from our country and exiled from our soil; we cannot fulfill our duties in your chosen dwelling and in your great and sacred temple in which your name is invoked. . . . Let us gather together from the far ends of the world. Lead us to Zion, your city, with rejoicing, and to Jerusalem, your sacred temple, with everlasting jubilation." But those who play a role in modern Jewry know nothing of this; they prefer to live in the *Jerusalemerstrasse* rather than in the streets of Jerusalem. A devout Christian once pitied a Jewish brother for not having a high priest and a temple. Oh, was the reply, our temple is the synagogue and our high priest is the *Herr Oberrabbiner.*

The religion of the Old Testament requires worship by sacrifices and services in the temple. Without them Judaism is a dry well and a withered tree. And barren it is, indeed, nothing but the shadow of the Christian church within whose sphere it is located: in Germany enlightened and torn apart in factions; in the Latin countries split between strictest Talmudism and unbelief; in the Slav nations petrified in formulas and again in the grip of wild frenzy; under the Crescent devoid of spirit and rotting like Islam itself. This is the picture of Judaism on earth. Lacking any creative religious force, it lives on nothing but its fantasies.

Occasionally, a ray of insight into the full extent of their own misery falls upon Jewish writers. You may read them in their magazines: "Religious fervor is declining in the elder as in the younger generation. Let us not be deceived by the symptoms of active participation in the interests of Jewry and Judaism, for it is not always religious conviction that inspires those men; they strive for external things rather than for the improvement of the spiritual life."

In Vienna a noble Jew complains: "The modern system of credit creates deep unrest, ethical frivolity, religious indifference; the teachers and spokesmen of our religion lack the courage to call these things by their right name!" In their sober moments even men like Philippson will say: "The younger generation is overcome by doubts that man can attain any firm convictions. All ideals have evaporated and nothing seems worth striving for save that which promises material benefits and wealth, honor, power, and pleasure. . . . Hence this mad spirit of speculation and this striving to become rich quickly, at the expense of others. There is an ebb tide in all the domains of art. We have neither poets, painters, sculptors, musicians, nor actors of original and lasting importance; those few who are left are gradually dying out without being replaced. Where are they to come from in a materialistic world deprived of any spiritual impetus? These are the consequences of atheism and materialism, as proved beyond any doubt by history and experience."

Even the reformed Israelitic weekly considers it worth while to present its readers with the following verse:

Überall wo es gilt zu sehn und zu hören,
Scheint die Zahl der Juden sich täglich zu mehren
In Promenaden, Theatern, Konzerten and Bällen
Siehst du meist Juden in allen Fällen.
Willst du wo mehr Christen als Juden sehn,
Musst du Freitag abend in die neue Synagoge gehn.

(Wherever there is something to be seen and heard,
The number of Jews seems to increase every day;
On promenades, in theaters, at concerts and balls
You are certain to see mostly Jews.
But if you want to see more Christians than Jews,
You'd better go to the new synagogue on a Friday night.)

"It is quite certain that in Berlin less than a quarter, probably hardly more than one tenth of all Jewish *Gymnasiasten und Realschüler* (high school pupils) over 13 ever hear a word of religious instruction." "Morality is limited to this precept: Whatever the criminal law does not forbid or whatever is beyond the reach of the judge in a criminal court is permissible, useful, shrewd." These Jewish voices date back to 1871; things have grown much worse in the meantime. The Jews fight our religion, but they know very well that man cannot live without religion. "A repulsive generation is being raised," says one of the reformers. "Even in its swaddling clothes it greedily craves pleasure and money, money and pleasure, and from adolescence on worships only the golden calf. Its only God is Mammon. The name and memory of Israel are thus delivered up to scorn, a scorn and hatred well deserved. Go on raising Jews without Judaism, and you will have Jews to whom that meaning of the word fully applies which fanatical hatred attributes to it."

And in spite of this truth, in spite of their utter lack of religious creativeness, they stick to their delusion of being a religious power. The truth is that modern Jewry is most certainly a power against religion; a power which bitterly fights Christianity everywhere, uproots Christian faith as well as national feeling in the people, in their stead offering them nothing but the idolatrous admiration of Jewry such as it is, with no other content but its self-admiration. Berthold Auerbach said quite correctly in his novel *Waldfried*: "The educated Jews are non-Christians rather than Jews." That is why they are fond of affecting free thought. Their credo is written on the empty page between the Old and the New Testament. But they never dream of openly conceding their poverty. They fashion a regal mantle from the rags of unbelief and manage to impress the undiscriminating mass of readers. For even today the Jew must pose as being vested with a task of historic importance. Even the most liberal reformer wants to remain a Jew. "May our Judaism become for us and remain for our children and our children's children what it was to our forefathers, a beloved, precious jewel. Every day anew we should be proud and happy to be Jews, followers of a religion that includes the origin and the final goal of humanity." This is what the leader of the congregation in Dresden wrote to the Jewish communities years ago.

They persist in remaining Jews. Yet it is obviously incongruous to refuse to believe in anything Jewish and at the same time remain a Jew, or to be a Jew in the narrowest sense of the word and at the same time to throw about utopian ideas of universal happiness (*Menschheitsbeglückungsideen*). The initiate everywhere cannot fail to notice how ridiculous these doings are. It becomes downright absurd, for instance, when a Dr. Berliner during the French war looks at world history through Jewish glasses. "I consider the last quarter of the fifteenth century to be the termination of the Middle Ages. It was then that the Jewish press started to operate, and a Jew, Tipsiles, of Augsburg, was said to have invented gun powder, with which, at last, the powerful fortresses of the Middle Ages could be breached." Did anyone of you know that Tipsiles invented gun powder? Does anybody really believe that it was the Jewish press rather than the renaissance, the discovery of America, and the reformation which initiated the modern age? Indeed, once this standpoint is adopted, it is easy to understand why they hold similar beliefs with regard to the future, culminating finally in the opinion that the world belong to the Jews. Cremieux said at a meeting of the Israelitic Association in Paris: "A new Messianic empire, a new Jerusalem, must arise in place of the emperors and popes." And a certain Dr. Rosenzweig recently suggested quite seriously that circumcision be made generally obligatory.

All this may have contributed to make the Jews, especially the Jewish newspaper boys, intolerant to such a degree as to become quite intolerable. We really mean it if we address our second request to the Jewish press: *please, be a little more tolerant!* Unlike many others who have dealt with this topic, we shall not quote the Talmud with its contempt for foreign peoples and its hatred for human rights. We do not feel that present-day Jewry in its totality can be made responsible for books which were written thousands of years ago. Otherwise we should also have to hold the Catholics responsible for the persecutions of heretics and the trials of the inquisition which no pope has ever disavowed. And a change in this respect has really occurred. The strict Jews still accept the Talmud as infallible, like the law. Some of them quite unreasonably declare that the whole Talmud, including all the vengeful and savage passages, is sacred to them. But it appears, nevertheless, that many years of living together with Christians and maintaining business relations with them, and the kinder spirit of modern times have caused the hatred of Christians to decline greatly in the synagogue.

The official hatred has ceased; the first Jewish synod even passed the following decision: "In the new prayers (*Gebetsstücke*) and in those which remain to be revised, all utterances which might be interpreted as expressions of bitterness or vindictiveness should be avoided." Yet the Jewish press exhales a hatred against everything Christian that is loathesome indeed. Articles are not signed in our papers and journals, and thus the objection may be raised that there is no way of knowing whether the anti-Christian articles have really been written by Jews. We even know that there are enough baptized scribblers on the editorial staffs of the papers to carry out the sorry task of reviling their church. But it is a fact that the worst Berlin papers are in the hands of Jews and that the Jewish element completely dominates the edi-

torial staffs. The most convincing evidence, however, is the fact that religious disputes among the Jewish factions are scarcely ever mentioned, that the rigors of Jewish orthodoxy are never touched upon, and that literary attacks against Jews are not to be found. Orthodox Jewry is never criticized: let it reject the nondenominational (*konfessionslose*) school and threaten unwed couples with excommunication—no liberal paper ever takes notice. But let such a thing happen in Christian meetings and the bloodhounds of the press are out in full cry. Our sacred institutions are constantly dragged into the dust; the synagogue is protected by the tacit agreement of all liberal newspapermen. Show us in the liberal press one single article which treats the day of atonement or the Talmud Associations as ignobly as the *Tageblatt* derides this year's Day of Repentance, one of our holiest days, or as the Berlin Jew press ridiculed our August conference. Christianity alone has to put up with such indignities. The Jewish chairman of the City Council of Berlin recently made a public statement on church matters which do not concern him at all and spoke in this connection about "real inquisitors who ardently desire to burn heretics at the stake." Who gives him the right to sow discord and incite hatred in the Christian population? This intolerance is unbearable.

As early as 1873 the paper of the reformers wrote: "The Jewish press is regrettably marred by bad taste and venom. A slanderous, bitter and aggressive tone sounds from every page. This has corrupted the public which has now developed a taste for spicy little stories." And how much worse the Jewish press has grown since! Where, in the Protestant, in the conservative press, would you ever find a trace of such ruthlessness? Whoever dared ridicule a Jewish holiday, the Jewish dietary and purification laws? The most elementary sense of decency should forbid desecrating what is sacred to a people. It is these continuous attempts at undermining the very foundation of a people's faith, morals, and national honor that are criminal and vile. The Social Democratic press has occasionally been more obscene; but some publications which are among the most widely read in Berlin are even more dangerous because they are less crude and much more venomous. Unless these wells of poison are cleaned out, the situation cannot improve. Benzenburg wrote as early as 1816: "Germany's splendor may perish with the Jews." If the Christians continue to expose themselves constantly to the influence of the Jewish spirit which deprives them of their German and Christian character this prophecy will certainly come true. But perhaps—and this is our hope—Germany's splendor will arise with new life after this period of decline. We should be indeed a nation without honor if we did not break these chains of a foreign mentality, if we really became Judaized.

Every sensible person must realize that the rule of the Semitic mentality means not only our spiritual but also our economic impoverishment. The German is a great idealist; for a time he will stand for others exploiting his love of ideas to their own profit. But in the end the figure of *Nathan der Weise* whom Lessing created out of Christian humanitarianism is bound to disappear behind that of Shylock, and the warning judgment of the Jews voiced by our best men—Kant, Fichte, Herder—will prove its validity.

The Jews are and remain a people within a people, a state within a state,

a separate tribe within a foreign race. All immigrants are eventually absorbed by the people among whom they live—all save the Jews. They pit their unbroken Semitic character against Teutonic nature, their rigid cult of law or their hatred of Christians against Christianity. We cannot condemn them for this; as long as they are Jews, they are bound to act in this way. But we must, in all candor, state the necessity of protecting ourselves against the dangers of such an intermingling. There are 45,000 Jews in Berlin alone, as many as there are in all of France, in all of England. That is too many. If they had a real bond with us, there would be nothing wrong with this figure. But this half of a hundred thousand lives by itself, in easy circumstances, with increasing power, equipped with a very profitable mind, and without any concern for our Christian-German interests. Therein lies the real danger.

We are approaching the Polish ratio in the Christian-Jewish population, save for the fact that the Berlin Jews are much richer, much more clever and influential than the Polish Israelites. They control the arteries of money, banking, and trade; they dominate the press and they are flooding the institutions of higher learning. The latter is certainly a beautiful trait; it has often moved me deeply to see how poor Jews sacrificed all they had to give their children an education. But this development is ominous. We are moving toward the point when public opinion will be completely dominated and labor completely exploited by the Jews. The process of disintegration is under way; nothing will stop it, unless we turn about and make the Jews turn about too. And this is where we make our third request. Modern Jewry must take part in productive work: *a little more equality, please!*

It used to be said that emancipation would push the Jews into other occupations. Now they are emancipated, but the opposite has happened. More than ever, they cultivate those trades where they can get rich quickly and easily. Lately they have been trying to squeeze into the judiciary, a matter that has not reacted well upon justice. They take almost no part at all in handicraft and little in industrial labor. That means that they do not enjoy work and that they do not believe in the German concept of the dignity of labor. To a great extent we have to thank them for the slogan "cheap and shoddy." They are to be found wherever misery and the instinct of gambling can be exploited. The launching of shady enterprises (*Gründungen*) and usury are undeniably their favorite occupations. They love to reap where they have not sown. If the big social question is that of a just division between wages and profits (*Arbeits- und Kapitalsertrag*), then those who systematically and immoderately exploit labor in the interest of capital represent the worst element in this question. It is true, the Jews, through Marx and Lassalle, have seen to it that they have their friends in the ranks of the Social Democrats as well; the nihilists in Russia are partly Jews. Nevertheless, their one-sided financial interests entail dangers for them too. For me the Jewish problem centers in the question as to whether the Jews who live in our midst will learn to participate in all aspects of German labor, including the hard toil of artisans, factory workers, and peasants. We should ask nothing more of them.

Even the general press of Jewry has not been able to forego some warnings in this respect. "It must be admitted that there are a number of Jews among the stock jobbers and swindlers, and more than the ratio of the population would warrant." "The inclination to learn a trade is disappearing more and more and even the youth in grammar schools and orphanages want almost exclusively to go into business. Many persecutions in the Middle Ages," they cannot help but admit, "were brought about because princes, nobility, and burghers were indebted to Jews, and tried to rid themselves of their obligations by exterminating all Jews, at least those who lived in their districts." One even finds the advice that "the tide of hatred of the Jews would recede more quickly, if the Jews learned the lessons of the past better and struggled to work and build on solid ground."

The question is: what shall be done? We believe that Jews and Christians must try to establish a proper relationship with each other. There is no other way. Hatred of the Jews is already flaring up here and there, and this is repugnant to the Gospels. If modern Jewry continues to use the power of capital and the power of the press to bring misfortune to the nation, a final catastrophe is unavoidable. Israel must renounce its ambition to become the master of Germany. It should renounce its arrogant claim that Judaism is the religion of the future, when it is so clearly that of the past. Let not foolish Christians continue to strengthen the self-conceit of this people. Jewish orthodoxy with its circumcision is decrepit, while reformed Judaism is not a Jewish religion at all. Once Israel has realized this, it will quietly forget its alleged mission and stop trying to rob of their Christianity people who offer it hospitality and civil rights. The Jewish press must become more tolerant—that is the first prerequisite for improving the situation. The social abuses which are caused by Jewry must be eradicated by wise legislation. It will not be easy to curb Jewish capital. Only thoroughgoing legislation can bring it about. The mortgage system in real estate should be abolished and property should be inalienable and unmortgageable; the credit system should be reorganized to protect the businessman against the arbitrary power of big capital. There must be new stock and stock-exchange regulations; reintroduction of the denominational census so as to find out the disproportion between Jewish capital and Christian labor; limitation of appointments of Jewish judges in proportion to the size of the population; removal of Jewish teachers from our grammar schools, and in addition the strengthening of the Christian-Germanic spirit—these are the means to put a stop to the encroachment of Jewry on Germanic life, this worst kind of usury.*

Either we succeed in this and Germany will rise again, or the cancer from which we suffer will spread further. In that event our whole future is threatened and the German spirit will become Judaized. The German economy will become impoverished. These are our slogans: A return to a Germanic rule in law and business, a return to the Christian faith. May every man do his duty, and God will help us.

* Untranslatable play on the words *überwuchern* and *wuchern*.

DOCUMENT NO. III

Anti-Semitism, Liberalism, and the Prussian Government

DEBATE ON THE JEWISH QUESTION IN THE PRUSSIAN DIET MARCH 21 AND 22, 1890*

A discussion on education generally and the value of classical education and the *Gymnasium* in particular preceded the debate of March 20 during which Stoecker took the floor first to defend classical education and the true spirit of learning (*wahre Gelehrsamkeit*). Antiquity, he argued, was the basis of the unique German *Bildung* (culture) and, together with Christianity, it will remain so. He then went on to praise the German school system, criticizing it only for overloading the student with academic knowledge.

"To me the ideal school system would be one that attempted to make the mind so eager and able to learn that it would be able to apply the capacities it has acquired by training in one field to some other field as well. This is certainly a serious shortcoming of our German character training. . . . Many highly educated and distinguished persons are yet unable to penetrate to the heart of a question. They learn nothing and forget everything. The joy of learning, the capacity for probing deeply have not been sufficiently developed."

Stoecker then praised the Prussian Minister of Public Worship and Instruction for furthering physical education and passed on to the problem of religious instruction. He considered it a mistake and a degradation to treat religious instruction as but one subject among many others in the school curriculum. The spirit of religious education either "permeates all instruction, in which case it somehow dominates each subject, or it is reduced to the position of just one more item in the curriculum, and not even a major one. . . ." But, Stoecker continued, this was not the main reason why he had asked for the floor.

"I wanted to say a word about the disproportionate Jewish element in some of our secondary schools (laughter on the left. Cries of 'Hear, hear!' on the right). . . .

"We consider it our political duty to draw attention to the fact that certain aspects of our secondary school system are marked by intolerable abuses which

* Excerpts from speeches by Adolf Stoecker, Heinrich Rickert, and von Gossler, Prussian Minister of Public Worship and Instruction. *Die Judendebatte im preussischen Abgeordnetenhause anlässlich der zweiten Beratung des Kultusétats am 20. und 21. März 1890.*

hamper the thorough moral and religious character training so necessary in our schools."

To demonstrate how serious the situation was Stoecker quoted statistics:

"I want to begin by reading a few figures to you, otherwise you may not realize how great is the harm that has been already done. Naturally I am not referring to conditions throughout the country but only to those prevailing in certain regions and cities, mainly Berlin, Breslau and Upper Silesia, and Frankfurt am Main. I shall deal with Berlin in detail. In 1887, according to the latest statistical yearbook, there were in all the *Gymnasiums* of the capital, state as well as municipal, 1,898 Jewish, 6,904 Protestant, 278 Catholic, and 26 nondenominational students. . . .

"But the picture becomes even more revealing when you consider each *Gymnasium* separately. There is, for instance, the *Französische Gymnasium* in which there are 193 Jewish compared to 222 Protestant and 12 Catholic students (cries of 'Hear, hear!' on the right), the *Wilhelmsgymnasium* with 201 Jewish compared to 541 Protestant pupils . . . in the *Köllnische Gymnasium* 180 compared to 340, in the *Friedrichsgymnasium* 202 compared to 349.

"These are the highest figures, but in the other schools as well the Jewish element is pretty strong. The matter gets even worse when you consider the upper grades; there the Jewish element is even greater. By Easter of 1886, for instance, there were in the *Oberprima* [high school senior class] of all *Gymnasiums* 52 Jews, compared to 132 Protestants, by Michaelis [fall term] 48 Jews, compared to 141 Protestants. In 1887 this proportion somewhat declined. . . . But even these figures are child's play compared to the percentages at some schools. As you know, the Jewish element congregates mainly in the business and high-class residential sectors of the city, and it is in the *Gymnasiums* of such neighborhoods that conditions prevail of which the honorable gentlemen who are not from Berlin certainly have not the slightest idea. At the *Französische Gymnasium*, for instance, there are 32 student in the *Obersekunda* [high school sophomore class] of whom 22 are Jews (cries of 'Hear, hear!'). At the last Easter term ten pupils were promoted from the *Untersekunda* to the *Obersekunda* [from freshmen to sophomore] of whom the class leader was—I state it with satisfaction—a Gentile, while the rest were Jews —which is much less to my satisfaction. At the *Wilhelmsgymnasium* 13 boys passed their *Abitur* [university entrance examination] including nine Jews. You will admit that this is really going too far (cries of 'Very true!'). It is precisely this enormous percentage that is so dangerous. . . .

"In the higher schools for girls (*höhere Töchterschulen*) things are even worse. In 1887 Berlin counted 1,639 Jewish students, compared to 3,446 Protestant, 63 Catholic, and 12 nondenominational girls. If you take the schools separately, you have the following figures: 239 Jewish, compared to 565 Protestant students, 256 compared to 586, 319 compared to 518, 308 compared to 589, 316 compared to 386. This is a situation which will eventually develop into a kind of Judaization (*Verjudung*) of the higher schools for girls (cries of 'Very true!')."

Stoecker then quoted some figures on the proportions in the Volksschulen

(elementary schools) where in his opinion the danger was not so great. However, here too there were many Jews.

"In the Gipsstrasse, for instance, another sector overcrowded with Jews, there is an elementary school which as long as three years ago had 131 Jewish boys and another with 151 Jewish girls. Here the solution should be simple. If in two public schools which are so close together there are 131 Jewish boys and 151 Jewish girls, a Jewish elementary school should be organized, under the constitution and the legal provisions (cries of 'Very true!' on the right)."

The problem in the high schools was such that Stoecker considered

". . . a solution quite difficult. But it should be possible if we approach the problem with the impartiality and clear mind required by the danger. In Frankfurt am Main Jewish high schools have existed for a long time; they were established before the Prussian time. There our Israelitic fellow citizens established their own high schools, from a sound and sensible awareness of the state of affairs. If Jews could do that for their *own* purposes, why should we not have the courage to do the same for *them* and for ourselves at the same time? (Cries of 'Very true!'). . . .

"Such proposals are by no means unconstitutional! The Jews will continue to enjoy equal rights; they can attend Christian schools just as Christians can go to their schools. . . . There exists full equality of rights. But that Christian schools in the German capital, the main scene of the intellectual struggles that must secure our future, should admit such a percentage of elements which preclude a Christian National education—that is certainly not equality of rights. I should rather call it preferential treatment (cries of 'Very true!' on the right). And that our Jewish fellow citizens have no right to claim. . . .

"I know how difficult it is to pick out in the so-called Jewish question those points that have reached the stage of development where they can be dealt with politically. I will admit that so far I know of but two factors that are, in my opinion, ready for action. Something can be done about the administration of justice, especially unrestricted legal practice . . . and about the growing preponderance of the Jewish element in our high schools. Something can, something must be done to protect our German people. Therefore, Herr Minister, permit me to tell you: *Videant consules, nequid detrimenti res publica capiat.*" (Vigorous applause on the right.)

*Rickert:** "I really do not think that this inflammatory speech by a Protestant minister (cries of 'Oho!' on the right), as delivered here by Herr Stoecker, directed as it is against a considerable group of our fellow citizens, is a very worthy chapter in Germany's parliamentary history. . . .

"Should not a man whose vocation it is to preach Christian charity and tolerance ask himself the question what effect such speeches might have on the tender minds of school children? Gentlemen, I just overheard a teacher

* Heinrich Rickert was a leader of the Progressives and a prominent opponent of anti-Semitism. He was one of the founders of the Defense League Against Anti-Semitism (*Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus*), a non-Jewish liberal organization.

next to me saying: 'I should not be surprised if those poor Jewish children now got beaten into the bargain' (laughter on the right).

"If such religious intolerance is preached even here in the House of Representatives, no wonder the boys and girls, the children of these men, put this doctrine to practical use in their relations with their Jewish classmates. . . . I believe Herr Stoecker has stored up enough fuel for that purpose. . . .

"The second point, however, which pains me just as deeply, is that the Herr *Kultusminister,* though the speech was addressed to him—Herr Stoecker made this clear—did not have a single word to reply to this speech. Gentlemen, I must confess: I have a different conception of the duties of a Prussian *Kultusminister* (cries of 'Aha!' on the right) and I believe that his predecessors, even those who were Conservatives, would have felt the obligation, confronted by such an oration, to protest against a speech which can have but one effect, to disturb the harmony that has hitherto prevailed among the children in school. Gentlemen, the Herr *Kultusminister* is the guardian of peace, he is the man to whom the care of the schools, and especially of religious peace, is entrusted, and I should like to ask him: Was this a speech he could afford to ignore, even if he agrees with Herr Stoecker's aims? I do not believe it. And I ask the Herr *Kultusminister*—of course, it is up to him whether or not he will vouchsafe me an answer—whether he agrees with the bias that emanates from every word of that speech?

"As for the facts, gentlemen: You cannot bear the idea that your children sit beside Jewish children in the high schools (cries of 'That is not the point!'). No? *What else then is the purpose of the speech?* After all, that was its only purpose. . . .

"It is amazing to see two souls dwelling within a single breast. Gentlemen, as a rule you are not at all so terribly opposed to Jewish capital (laughter on the left). When a member of the *Junker* party is to be taken care of, or a splendid career is to be prepared for him with the help of Jewish capital, then the Jews are good enough, then they are exalted, introduced into society, fussed over (cries of 'Very true!' on the left). And when certain Jewish bankers give money for political purposes which serve your interests, then the Jew is a fine fellow. For the rest, you don't wish to have anything to do with him, and even want to prevent his children from sitting on the same school bench as your children.

"I do not think such conditions are *unbearable*: On the contrary, they are a rather gratifying indication of the urge for education that inspires our Jewish fellow citizens. . . . What gives you the right to try to *force* the Jews into *special Jewish schools*? Is that perhaps constitutional and lawful? . . . I say no! You don't have any legal basis for satisfying your desire, and I wonder whether the Herr *Kultusminister* will agree with you that these ideas of Stoecker, which are clearly those of the Conservative Party, can be adopted.

"Gentlemen, you will not succeed in separating the Jewish spirit, in so far as it is German, from the national spirit. On the pages of German history there are inscribed many great deeds, mainly in the domain of the intellect, accomplished by our Jewish fellow citizens. . . . Gentlemen (addressing the

right), what would your party have been if Stahl, who was a Jew, had not been your champion and preacher—a Conservative worth ten Stoeckers? . . .

"Herr Stoecker is particularly worried about the fact that there are 22, I repeat 22 students among the 32 pupils in the *Obersekunda* of the *Französische Gymnasium* (exclamations on the right). . . .

"That is really frightening. A friend of mine has just sent for the directory and looked up the names of the teachers. For I thought that there might really be a danger that all the teachers were Jewish. To judge by the names, however, there may actually be one Jew among them! I really do not understand Herr Stoecker's horror at having 22 Jewish children taught by Protestant teachers. Is that, perhaps, a proof of his confidence in the power of persuasion of the 'Christian National' spirit? If you were not afraid of having Jewish children taught by Christian teachers and if you had more confidence in the 'Christian National' spirit, you should be proud of the fact that these children are being taught by Christian teachers. But far from being proud, Herr Stoecker is afraid. He does not believe in the power of the Christian National spirit, and this is the reason that he pleads for religious segregation. . . .

"Herr Stoecker talked a great deal about the moral spirit of Christianity. Well, Herr Stoecker, if the moral spirit of Christianity consists in acting in so unkind, unjust, and reprehensible a manner against the children of our Jewish fellow citizens then the Prussian people will certainly not embrace it. They will turn away from Stoecker's narrow-minded bigotry."

Kultusminister Dr. v. Gossler: "I did not find in Herr Stoecker's speech all those outrages censured by the previous speaker (cries of 'Very true!' on the right). I think that the character of the speech delivered by Herr Stoecker was a different one, and if I take the floor, it is mainly in order to express my belief that *Herr Rickert has attacked a speech by Herr Stoecker he would have preferred to have heard, but not the speech actually delivered* (cries of 'Very good!' on the right).

"The problem raised by Deputy Stoecker—*how to adjust the denominational structure of our high school system*—is one of the thorniest confronting the administration of education; it is complex because of the relation between the two major Christian faiths, and it is no less complex because of the Jewish and the nondenominational elements, regardless of tolerance. I recall to your mind the legal stipulations, according to which everybody, regardless of creed and religion, has access to the public schools. He has no right, however, to demand that the doctrines of his creed should be taught in schools which have a denominational character, in accordance with the law. . . . Beyond that it is clear, however, that if extensive denominational intermixture results, this entails considerable difficulties for the educational authorities. The question of nondenominational schools (*Simultanschulen*) has often been discussed here. We cannot exclude the nondenominational school entirely from the public school system, though you know that I have always tried to dispose of this eternal bone of contention, supported in this endeavor by a large fraction of the House, including the Liberals. For wherever the nondenominational schools

have disappeared—because there was no need for their existence—peace among the creeds has been established.

"The problem becomes much more involved in the field of higher education. . . ."

The Minister explained that in big cities separation into strictly Catholic or Jewish *Gymnasiums* was not feasible on account of the great distances and then quoted figures on the shifts in the denominations. He stressed the difficulties for the school administration which resulted from the fact that Jews have different holidays which often interfere with the curriculum. Therefore, a more widespread denominational separation appeared to be desirable.

"In view of the fact that the questions that have been raised here are of considerable importance I should like to point out that, according to a statistical survey of 1885–86, there were 72 per cent Protestants, 17.6 per cent Catholics, and 9.7 per cent Jews in the student body of the high schools—that is, the number of Jews amounted to more than half the number of Catholics (cries of 'Hear, hear!'). A statistical survey for the Prussian universities in 1886–87 revealed approximately the same percentages—almost 70 per cent Protestants, a little over 20 per cent Catholics, and about 9½ per cent Jews.

"If one compares this figure with the population of the Prussian State, it will be seen that the male population of Prussia consists of 64¼ per cent Protestants, a little over 34 per cent Catholics, and only about 1.29 per cent Jews (cries of 'Hear, hear!').

"Well, gentlemen, that is a fact! I am not drawing any conclusions from it, but it certainly is a rather relevant fact that we have in Prussia about 1.29 per cent male Jews, while we have 9.58 per cent Jews at the universities (exclamation: 'But why?').

"The reasons given by the author of this statistical survey are rather weighty. They may be described as a greater native ability—one gentleman spoke in that sense here today—a greater desire for education, large financial means; but what surprised me greatly when I was studying these figures was the great influence of the place of residence. Eighty-two per cent of all Jews live in cities, while only 40 per cent of the Protestants and 31 per cent of the Catholics live in cities. . . . One gains the impression that the Gentile creeds supply the large masses of workers, homesteaders, and farm laborers, while a large part of our Jewish fellow citizens do not care to settle in the country but prefer to live in cities. That is the reason for the disproportionate increase of the Jewish element in our high schools and universities. . . . Gentlemen, I really do not know what conclusions you wish me to draw from that fact. The question in itself is quite important, it is important to make clear how the denominations are distributed within a state. . . . It is quite an important fact that a sector of the population which represents only about 1 per cent of the total population, supplies about 10 per cent of the educated classes (cries of 'Very true!' on the right). . . .

"The only conclusion I can draw is to say: the distribution of the denominations is of objective interest to the administration of education. I followed Herr Stoecker's speech attentively and my own findings are rather the same.

I did not gain the impression that he intended to force the administration of education to adopt specific measures (cries of 'Very true!'). I had rather the impression that he wanted to point to a phenomenon which exists in our public life (cries of 'Very true!'). Some of you may approve of the situation, others may want to have it altered. But that is not new to the administration of education. I can only say that I have accumulated much more material since 1883, some of which I have here in my hands, but to my knowledge I have not infringed upon the rights of any Jew as yet! (Laughter.)

"I owe it to my country that the administration of education should be able to turn its attention to this matter without being told every moment that I intend to take some step or other. I would not know what kind of a step I should take in this connection."

DOCUMENT NO. IV

THE CATHOLIC CENTER PARTY'S ARGUMENT AGAINST ANTI-JEWISH LEGISLATION

AS STATED IN THE 1895 REICHSTAG DEBATE ON MOTIONS FOR A BILL TO STOP FURTHER IMMIGRATION OF FOREIGN JEWS.*

The Catholic speaker, Deputy Lieber,† first pointed out that the passage of laws prohibiting further Jewish immigration would violate existing agreements on trade and residence rights which the Reich had concluded with other countries. Moreover, such Reich legislation would conflict with constitutional privileges held by German states, for instance Bavaria. He then continued:

"For these reasons alone, I and my political friends are not in a position to support these motions, and I earnestly beg you not to underestimate our scruples with regard to any violation of treaties and constitutions.

"When I now turn to the matter itself, I must emphasize that today as before we hold the view in this as well as other questions that we do not want discriminatory laws of any kind. We do not want any discriminatory laws against certain classes of our fellow citizens, against political or economic parties, nor do we want discriminatory laws against certain creeds nor—as certain people put it so delicately—against certain races. I shall not trouble at this time to inquire into the purity of the Teutonic or Aryan blood of those who today speak rashly about the Jewish or Semitic race.

"Gentlemen, it has been repeatedly emphasized, in particular last Wednesday by Deputy Dr. Paasche‡ and in earlier phases by my political friends, that we do not fail to recognize that our Jewish fellow citizens—and I must include them in my consideration since these motions are meant to be but the first step toward a general solution of the Jewish question—have repeatedly given us cause for serious complaints.

* *Reichstag, Stenographische Berichte,* March 6, 1895, pp. 1286 ff. The motions were made by members of the Conservative and Anti-Semitic groups.

† Although the Reichstag minutes record Lieber as "farmer, Saxony, Catholic Center Party," it is most likely that the speaker was identical with the Catholic parliamentarian Ernst Lieber who, after Windthorst's death in 1891, became a leader of the Catholic Reichstag group.

‡ Professor Hermann Paasche, economist and spokesman of an active colonial policy, was a member of the National Liberal Party.

"Those of us in particular who bore the brunt of the *Kulturkampf* will never forget how viciously and brutally Jewish pens attacked, dragged into the mud, reviled, ridiculed and insulted all that is sacred to us and that we were called on to defend so strenuously and painstakingly. Even today we see with great sorrow and just indignation those pens that continue to fight not only us and all that we Catholics respect but—one must state it candidly when one thinks, for instance, of the *Zukunft,** I mean the periodical, not the times to come —that do not even shrink from attacking most viciously the highest values in the life of our nation and people. We also deplore a number of abuses in our economic life, for which the Jews are greatly to blame.

"However, while we do not close our eyes to this fact, we cannot but recognize that it is not the Jews alone who are to blame. Centuries of discrimination have left them virtually no other occupations than those in which the defects we deplore thrive most easily and manifest themselves most grievously.

"Viewing the problem from all angles, we consider it the task of just legislation, honestly devoted to the fatherland, to strive for the general removal of general abuses through general legal stipulations.

"You will never lure us into supporting discriminatory legislation, if only for reasons of justice. . . .

"As a minority in the Reich, we have not forgotten how we were treated and for this reason alone, not to speak of higher considerations and deeper motives, we shall never lend a hand to forge weapons to be used today against the Jews, tomorrow against the Poles, the day after tomorrow against the Catholics. . . .

"Don't expect our support in making it possible for you to exult: 'We got rid of the Jews. Now *bon voyage* to the Catholics!'"

* Maximilian Harden's weekly, which, incidentally, was often highly critical of the Jewish group. Underlying Lieber's attack on the *Zukunft* was probably less Harden's Jewish origin than his support of Bismarck, the old adversary of the Catholic Church.

DOCUMENT NO. V

Social Democratic Criticism of Anti-Semitic "Reform"

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN THE REICHSTAG, NOVEMBER 30, 1893.*

Answering the speeches of Liebermann von Sonnenberg and Zimmermann who had presented anti-Semitism as a "cultural movement," Liebknecht declared:

"First of all anti-Semitism is not a cultural movement (*Kulturbewegung*) and secondly the movement which it represents does not exist in other civilized countries. An attempt in this direction was made in France, but the whole anti-Semitic gang foundered in the muck of the Panama affair. There is no anti-Semitic movement in England, nor is there one in America or in Italy. The movement is limited to Germany, and here it has become possible only as a result of the unsound political conditions that prevail in our country, though I do not at all deny the economic basis of anti-Semitism.

"A movement that wants to tax machines claims to be a *Kulturbewegung*? You want to help the little man by attacking the machine? You are aware that the machine ruins the little man but you don't see that behind the machine looms the whole system of modern capitalism, the whole bourgeois society, and to a certain extent the whole culture whose representative you wrongly pretend to be. How can you help the little man? By smashing capitalism! You can achieve that not by imposing a tax on machines, but by destroying modern big industry, modern large-scale agriculture, the big trusts, in short everything on which modern culture is founded. In this respect we Social Democrats hold views that differ sharply from those you represent. We too recognize the evils you indicate and want to eradicate them. But *you* say you want to cure them by breaking with modern civilization and returning to the conditions of the Middle Ages—that would be the consequence of the measures you advocate. *We* say: the present capitalist form of society is a necessary period of transition; we must go through that period, we must preserve all the advantages which capitalism has given us and save the culture which it no longer is able to represent, in order to establish a *higher form of society*, founded on justice, reason and equality. We are a *Kulturpartei*, something that cannot be said of you at all. You are the representatives of anticulture.

* *Reichstag, Stenographische Berichte*, November 30, 1893, pp. 180 ff. The debate on the "Jewish question" developed in the course of the Reichstag discussion of the budget for 1894–95.

"You insinuate that there is some method behind our 'peculiar' attitude toward the taxation of stock-exchange transactions, that a secret is involved which may be revealed at some later date. The only thing 'peculiar' about our attitude is that we reject any kind of new tax. What of the secret, Herr Zimmermann,* which you have proclaimed so loudly? Go ahead, speak up! You have blurted it out a hundred times and have shouted it from the rooftops: the 'secret' is that we are paid by the Jews. The whole of Social Democracy is in the pay of the Jews. We will not bother to answer such charges; the Social Democrats are a popular party, indeed. I have, at the moment, a letter in my pocket which refers to the Jesuit bill† and insists that we have sold ourselves to the Jesuits."

Liebknecht then went on to enumerate a number of other groups and people to whom the Social Democrats were said to have sold themselves, and continued:

"Those gentlemen will never be able to cure what they seek to cure, because, true to the practice of quacks, they do not dream of getting at the roots of the evil. Instead of fighting the causes, they stick to the symptoms and incidental factors. You have not helped and you will not help the small craftsman and the small peasant whose main advocate you claim to be. You are unable to help them because you do not understand what is at stake. When one pays some attention to the practical aspects of your proposals, your social cure turns out to be on about the same level as the old Schulze-Delitzsch‡ gospel for the lower middle classes and craftsmen. You want to preserve the so-called *Mittelstand* and think you can do it by using petty palliatives such as the organization of credit, cooperative stores, etc. Why don't you study the history of the social movement in Germany since Schulze-Delitzsch? . . . The small craftsman is going to the dogs with ever-increasing rapidity, and with all your remedies you are not going to save a single peasant. Well, you say, at least we can hit capitalism, which is dangerous to the little man, in *one* of its expressions, in the form of the Jew—let's get at Jewish capitalism! [You say] that it is above all Jewish capital which is to blame for the disintegration and ruin of handicraft, the peasantry, and agriculture in general. But that's a fallacy! I have told you so before: Look at England, at America! There Jewish capital has never played a part, there a Rothschild can never play a part, because bourgeois society there has developed on a grand and gigantic scale. If you ask about the peasant class in England, people will laugh at you. For generations there have been no peasants in England. They have been wiped out by big capital, by big capitalist concerns which are almost exclusively in Christian hands. And what about America? I told you on a pre-

* Anti-Semitic deputy elected to Reichstag in 1890, friend of Boeckel.

† The Jesuit order was outlawed in 1872, as one of Bismarck's first measures in the *Kulturkampf*, but the Catholic Center never tired in its fight to have the ban repealed. The Social Democrats, opposed to all oppressive legislation, backed the Catholics. Under Bülow's chancellorship (1904) the anti-Jesuits Act was partly rescinded, during World War I (1917) it was fully repealed.

‡ Schulze-Delitzsch, a social reformer, saw in the organization of producers' cooperatives the best way of raising the living standards of the workers and craftsmen.

vious occasion that the farmers in the United States who had developed under the most favorable economic conditions—and who were considered an ideally happy peasantry, are today debt-ridden; that according to official statistics the American farmers are encumbered with mortgages amounting to eight billion dollars. Well, almost no part of this gigantic sum is stored in the vaults of Jewish capitalists who play as little a part in America as they do in England. The capitalists who have swallowed the peasant in England and who are now swallowing him in America are Christian Anglo-Saxons, they are just as Teutonic as our own anti-Semites and at least as Christian, for the English and the American capitalist conscientiously goes to church twice every Sunday.

"So you see, gentlemen, that Jewry has nothing to do with the decline and fall of the peasant class. We Social Democrats know it and we do not tell the peasant: it is the Jew who ruins you. But we may say something else: it is the *Junker*, who calls you brother—brother peasant—who embraces you with the tenderness of a boa constrictor coiling around its victim, who loves you enough to eat you, as the saying goes, and who actually gobbles you up. The *Junker* has swallowed more peasant farmsteads than the Jew. Look at the list of those who have driven off peasants in Prussia, especially in the eastern provinces! How many *Junkers* do you have there and how many Jews? . . . But the *Junker* no more ruins the peasant in his capacity as a *Junker* than does the Jew in his capacity as a Jew. He does it, just like the latter, because he is richer, because he has more money than the little farmer. He ruins the small peasant according to the same iron laws of economics which make Herr Krupp, another friend of the little man, ruin the little craftsman, namely through his greater capital—even if he personally is the most humane man in the world. This is simply in the nature of economic development, of laws it is no more within your power to alter than in mine, which can be suspended only by changing the foundation of our present society. . . .

"You [anti-Semites] tell the peasants that you can save them by your absurd remedies. We tell the peasants: in our present society you cannot be saved; it is not the Jews who ruin you, as the anti-Semitic gentlemen are trying to tell you; don't believe the words of men who appeal to your prejudices, who appeal to stupidity; your enemy is the present social system; your enemy is capitalism and if you want to save yourselves, there is only one means—not capitalism, not running after false prophets, but the transformation of capitalist society into a socialist society. Instead of fighting us, help us to fight your enemy and ours. We do not make promises which cannot be kept, whereas every word you say is immediately given the lie by the test of practical application."

DOCUMENT NO. VI

Hermann Ahlwardt on the Semitic Versus the Teutonic Race

EXCERPTS FROM HIS REICHSTAG SPEECH IN FAVOR OF LEGISLATION TO CLOSE GERMANY'S BORDERS TO "ISRAELITES WHO ARE NOT CITIZENS OF THE REICH."*

"It is certainly true that there are Jews in our country of whom nothing adverse can be said. Nevertheless, the Jews as a whole must be considered harmful, for the racial traits of this people are of a kind that in the long run do not agree with the racial traits of the Teutons. Every Jew who at this very moment has not as yet transgressed is likely to do so at some future time under given circumstances because his racial characteristics drive him on in that direction. . . .

"My special political friends—well, I admit their number is none too great in the House, but that their number is not quite so small in the country some of you will realize, in spite of your laughter, when you lose your seats—well, these gentlemen share my views. When one of the previous speakers, Herr Hasse,† asserts that we anti-Semites are fighting the Jews on account of their religion, then I say:

"My political friends do not hold the view that we fight the Jews because of their religion. Religious feelings are much too delicate to withstand the rude grasp of politics. We would not dream of waging a political struggle against anyone because of his religion. For this reason we support, for instance, the repeal of the law against the Jesuits, although I personally cannot claim to have any particular liking for the Jesuits. We hold the view that the Jews are a different race, a different people with entirely different character traits.

"Experience in all fields of nature shows that innate racial characteristics which have been acquired by the race in the course of many thousands of years are the strongest and most enduring factors that exist, and that therefore we can rid ourselves of the characteristics of our race no more than can the Jews. One need not fight the Jew individually, and we are not doing that, by the way. But, when countless specimens prove the existence of certain

* *Reichstag, Stenographische Berichte,* March 6, 1895, pp. 1297 ff.

† Professor Ernst Hasse, National Liberal, was a charter member and the first president of the Pan-German League.

racial characteristics and when these characteristics are such as to make impossible a common life, well, then I believe that we who are natives here, who have tilled the soil and defended it against all enemies—that we have a duty to take a stand against the Jews who are of a quite different nature.

"We Teutons are rooted in the cultural soil of labor (*Kulturboden der Arbeit*); each of us seeks to work for others and demands in return that others work for him. It is on this soil of culture that we have worked our way up from past barbarity to our present state of civilization. It is different with the Jews. The Jews do not believe in the culture of labor, they do not want to create values themselves, but want to appropriate, without working, the values which others have created; that is the cardinal difference that guides us in all our considerations.

"The Jews want to grab what others have produced by their work; we ourselves would be content, if we could only get what we have labored for. If you take this point of view into account and examine whether it is justified, you will certainly judge our views less disparagingly than you are doing now.

"Herr Deputy Rickert* here has just expounded how few Jews we have altogether and that their number is steadily declining. Well, gentlemen, why don't you go to the main business centers and see for yourselves whether the percentages indicated by Herr Rickert prevail there too. Why don't you walk along the Leipzigerstrasse [in Berlin]† or the Zeil in Frankfurt† and have a look at the shops? Wherever there are opportunities to make money, the Jews have established themselves, but not in order to work—no, they let others work for them and take what the others have produced by their labor. The other day, when I was walking along the Zeil in Frankfurt am Main, I felt very sad indeed. I said to myself, how terribly did it suffer in the Thirty-Years' War, in the Seven-Years' War, in the Wars of the French Revolution and in the Napoleonic Wars! But whatever they may have suffered, they did remain citizens of their town, they had not been driven from the homes their fathers had built. But the Jews have achieved what no foreign enemy was ever able to achieve: They have driven the people from the city to the suburbs. And that's how things are wherever Jews have settled in numbers.

"Gentlemen, the Jews are indeed beasts of prey, they work like beasts of prey. You cannot alter this fact and only by proving that the Jews are just as productive as the Germans can you marshal a serious argument against us. All the empty phrases that have been uttered here are to no avail.

"When Deputy Hasse says that the anti-Semitic movement is pointless, I beg to disagree. When a serious wrong exists which may lead to ruin—and you will not deny that this is the case—then the fight against such wrong is never pointless, provided it is waged with sufficient thoroughness. And you may be assured that we are going to be thorough. What matters is that you should understand the inner substance of our endeavors—even though certain aspects may still be immature and faulty. I feel sure that eventually all of you will adopt our views.

* About Rickert see Document No. III.

† Main business streets.

"Deputy Hasse attempted to explain anti-Semitism by saying that the peoples of the world are now steering a somewhat nativist course. I shall not deny that fact but the gentleman has committed the grave mistake of putting the Jews and other peoples on the same level, and that is the worst mistake that we could possibly make.

"The Jews have an attitude toward us which differs totally from that of other peoples. It is one thing when a Pole, a Russian, a Frenchman, a Dane immigrates to our country, and quite another thing when a Jew settles here. . . . Once our [Polish, etc.] guests have lived here for ten, twenty years, they come to resemble us. For they have stood with us on the same cultural soil of labor. . . . After thirty, forty years they have become Germans and their grandchildren would be indistinguishable from us except for the strange-sounding names they still bear. The Jews have lived here for 700, 800 years, but have they become Germans? Have they placed themselves on the cultural soil of labor? They never even dreamed of such a thing; as soon as they arrived, they started to cheat and they have been doing that ever since they have been in Germany. . . .

"The Jews should not be admitted, whether or not there is overpopulation, for they do not belong to a productive race, they are exploiters, parasites."

Answering Rickert's arguments that there was already too much, not too little legislative interference, and that it would be a shame if fifty million Germans were afraid of a few Jews, Ahlwardt continued:

"So we are to leave the Jews alone, because we already have too many laws! Well, I believe if we did away with the Jews, we could also do away with half the laws now on our books.

"Herr Rickert, who is just as tall as I am, is afraid of one single cholera bacillus—well, gentlemen, the Jews are just that, cholera bacilli!

"Gentlemen, the crux of the matter is Jewry's capacity for contagion and exploitation. . . . How many thousands of Germans have perished as a result of this Jewish exploitation, how many may have hanged themselves, shot themselves, drowned themselves, how many may have ended by the wayside as tramps in America or drawn their last breath in the gutter, all of them people who had worked industriously on the soil their fathers had acquired, perhaps in hundreds of years of hard work. . . . Don't you feel any pity for those countless Germans? Are they to perish unsung? Ah, why were they foolish enough to let themselves be cheated? But the Germans are by no means so foolish, they are far more intelligent than the Jews. All inventions, all great ideas come from the Germans and not from the Jews. No, I shall tell you the national difference: The German is fundamentally trusting, his heart is full of loyalty and confidence. The Jew gains this confidence, only to betray it at the proper moment, ruining and pauperizing the German. This abuse of confidence on the part of the Jews is their main weapon. And these Jewish scoundrels are to be defended here! Is there no one to think of all those hundreds of thousands, nor of those millions of workers whose wages grow smaller and smaller because Jewish competition brings the prices down? One always hears: you must be humane toward the Jews. The humanitarianism

of our century, this humaneness of beasts of prey* is our curse. Why aren't you for once humane toward the oppressed? You'd better exterminate those beasts of prey and you'd better start by not letting any more of them into our country.

"Herr Rickert is of the opinion that the situation of the Jews was not so bad in the East, because there they were carrying out a cultural mission. I would like to tell you that the day before yesterday I made a trip to the East to the Russian border to have a close look at the real Jews. If you come to a city like Flatow, Meseritz, Bomst, etc., you will hardly find any German shops at all. Business is completely in Jewish hands, and the Jew exploits everybody at will! And you speak of a cultural mission! How does he carry out this mission with regard to the peasants? Why don't you go and ask them what they are getting for their grain? They work from 3 A.M. until 9 P.M. until they drop, and you ask who derives the profit from the crop! Most of the people are so poor that they cannot wait until the harvest is in. They must ask for advance payment, and the Jew gets the poor people's grain for next to nothing. Without the Jew no one can sell cattle or grain, no one can buy a pair of shoes. The Jew carries out his cultural mission by maintaining these regions in a state of barbarism (*Unkultur*). The people there are all poor. Wherever the Jews put in their appearance, the Germans become poor. Once they are completely impoverished, the Jews leave. Yes, Herr Deputy Rickert, where there is nothing to grab, you won't find any Jews. But they are here, and now they are sitting in the big cities, especially in Berlin.

"If you walk out of this building, you are right in Berlin's west side. Have a good look at what you see there! Do you see those splendid villas? It has been said that we are just jealous and that we would sing a different tune if we owned those villas. No anti-Semite is jealous as an individual, but we would like to see members of our people live in those villas, and not Jews. And come along with me to the neighborhood where I live. Two, three families in a single room . . . [describes the squalor of their living conditions]. Here live the useful people, there the scum that does not work but uses the labor of others to lead a luxurious life.

"Now Deputy Rickert declares that tramps, beggars and such nuisances should be dealt with ruthlessly, but that we cannot put the Jews on the same level with these people. . . . I do not want to put the Jews on the same level with these people. For these tramps, these beggars are, from a Christian viewpoint, our brothers. They are Germans like us. They have been ruined, partly through their own fault, partly as a result of unfortunate circumstances. Many of these people could still be saved if you offered them work, if you were to take care of them, but do you really believe you could save a Jew? Do you really believe you can break a Jew of the habit of cheating? . . .

"The fight against Catholicism is a serious symptom of growing pains (*schwere Kinderkrankheit*) in the new German Reich, for which we have had to pay dearly. Politics should keep hands off religious matters and the state

* The psychologist will find it noteworthy that *Rektor* Ahlwardt uses the term *Raubtierhumanität* (humaneness of beasts of prey) instead of *Humanität für Raubtiere* (humaneness towards beasts of prey).

should give complete freedom to all religious communities. But the part the Jews have played in inciting Catholics and Protestants against each other—that is another story. . . . During the twelve years in which we, Protestants and Catholics, have been fighting each other, the Jew has been dipping his hands in the pockets of both of us. . . ."

The opponents of the proposed anti-Jewish bill had appealed to the Christian spirit of human brotherhood, to which Ahlwardt replied:

"All men are our fellows but above all the oppressed, the exploited. This means that the Germans are our nearest brothers, and only then the Jews. Only when we have saved the Germans from the Jews, only when the Jews no longer can harm us, only then may the Jew also become our fellow. . . .

"We do not want discriminatory legislation against Germans at all, and particularly not against people who do productive work in our fatherland,* but these parasites must be made harmless by a special law . . ."

Taking issue with the liberals' argument of Jewish achievements in the arts, Ahlwardt declared:

"Art in my opinion is the capacity for expressing one's innermost feelings in such a way as to arouse the same feelings in the other person. Now the Jewish world of emotions (*Gefühlswelt*) and the Teutonic world of emotions are two quite different things. German art can express only German feelings; Jewish art only Jewish feelings. Because Jewry has been thrusting itself forward everywhere, it has also thrust itself forward in the field of art and therefore the art that is now in the foreground is Jewish art. Nowadays the head of a family must be very careful when he decides to take his family to the theater lest his Teutonic feelings be outraged by the infamous Jewish art that has spread everywhere.

"The Jew is no German. If you say, the Jew was born in Germany, he was nursed by a German wetnurse, he abides by German laws, he has to serve as a soldier—and what kind of a soldier at that! let's not talk about it—he fulfills all his obligations, he pays his taxes—then I say that all this is not the crucial factor with regard to his nationality; the crucial factor is the race from which he stems. Permit me to make a rather trite comparison which I have already used elsewhere in my speeches: a horse that is born in a cowshed is far from being a cow.†

"A Jew who was born in Germany does not thereby become a German; he is still a Jew. Therefore it is imperative that we realize that Jewish racial characteristics differ so greatly from ours that a common life of Jews and Germans under the same laws is quite impossible because the Germans will perish.

"Gentlemen, many hundreds of thousands have been degraded to the proletariat; those who still hold out are in the end bound to follow suit. Therefore

* Allusion to the anti-Socialist act which had expired in 1890 but which the die-hards tried to revive.

† Julius Streicher's *Stürmer* used the same kind of metaphor, substituting a pig for Ahlwardt's horse.

I beg you from the bottom of my heart not to take this matter* lightly but as a very serious thing. It is a question of life and death for our people. . . .

"We wouldn't think of going as far as have the Austrian anti-Semites in the Federal Council (*Reichsrat*) and to move that a bounty be paid for every Jew shot or to decree that he who kills a Jew shall inherit his property. We have no such intention. We shall not go as far as that. What we want is a clear and reasonable separation of the Jews from the Germans. An immediate prerequisite is that we slam the door and see to it that no more of them get in."†

* Prohibition of Jewish immigration.

† The attitude of the Conservatives was expressed in classic fashion by Deputy von Manteuffel, who was one of the movers of the resolution to close the German frontiers to Jewish immigrants. Said he: "This motion should not be at all interpreted as having an anti-Semitic tendency . . . or, worse, as inciting anti-Semitic bias. . . . It would above all . . . serve the interests of the Jews who are now living in Germany." (Reichstag, *Stenographische Berichte*, March 6, 1895, p. 1303.) At the end of the debate a vote was taken, with 218 representatives present. Of these, 51 voted for, 167 against the motion.

DOCUMENT NO. VII

The Racists' Decalogue

"TEN GERMAN COMMANDMENTS OF LAWFUL SELF-DEFENSE"*

I. Be proud of being a German and strive earnestly and steadily to practice the inherited virtues of our people, courage, faithfulness and veracity, and to inspire and develop these virtues in thy children.

II. Thou shalt know that thou, together with all thy fellow Germans, regardless of faith or creed, hast a common implacable foe. His name is Jew.

III. Thou shalt keep thy blood pure. Consider it a crime to soil the noble Aryan breed of thy people by mingling it with the Jewish breed. For thou must know that Jewish blood is everlasting, putting the Jewish stamp on body and soul unto the farthest generations.

IV. Thou shalt be helpful to thy fellow German and further him in all matters not counter to the German conscience, the more so if he be pressed by the Jew. Thou shalt at once take into court any offense or crime committed by the Jew in deed, word or letter, that comes to thy knowledge, lest the Jew abuse the laws of our country with impunity.

V. Thou shalt have no social intercourse with the Jew. Avoid all contact and community with the Jew and keep him away from thyself and thy family, especially thy daughters, lest they suffer injury of body and soul.

VI. Thou shalt have no business relations with the Jew. Never choose a Jew as a business partner, nor borrow nor buy from him, and keep your wife, too, from doing so. Thou shalt sell nothing to him, nor use him as an agent in thy transactions, that thou mayest remain free and not become slave unto the Jew nor help to increase his money, which is the power by which he enslaves our people.

VII. Thou shalt drive the Jew from thy own breast and take no example from Jewish tricks and Jewish wiles, for thou shalt never match the Jew in trickery but forfeit thy honor and earn the contempt of thy fellow Germans and the punishment of the courts.

* Fritsch, Theodor: *Antisemiten-Katechismus* (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 358 ff.

VIII. Thou shalt not entrust thy rights to a Jewish lawyer, nor thy body to a Jewish physician, nor thy children to a Jewish teacher lest thy honor, body and soul suffer harm.

IX. Thou shalt not lend ear nor give credence to the Jew. Keep away all Jewish writings from thy German home and hearth lest their lingering poison may unnerve and corrupt thyself and thy family.

X. Thou shalt use no violence against the Jews because it is unworthy of thee and against the law. But if a Jew attack thee, ward off his Semitic insolence with German wrath.

DOCUMENT NO. VIII

Autobiographical Explanations of Anti-Semitism

---

a. *THE JUNKER**

Up to my thirtieth year I was an anti-Semite; first by instinct, then by conviction, and, finally, I was plagued by doubts. Each human being is in the beginning the product of his environment and education. Someone who grew up in an arch-conservative castle in the most conservative election district of Prussia cannot very well be expected to have the mentality of the *Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus.* As a child I saw Jews only as rawhide and rag Jews who came to our estate to buy and sell. They were poor devils of a most embarrassing servility, the kind of people who if they are thrown out at the front door, will return by the back door. Nobody hated them but they were despised. Inferior race!

That was altogether the belief in which I was brought up: The Jews are different from us and beneath us. They don't want to work but only to haggle. They know no principle of ethics but that of making money at all costs. That's why one should be careful with them. Best to avoid them altogether—for *qui mange du juif, en meurt.*

At high school, I proceeded according to this formula. We had at most a half-dozen Jewish schoolmates. We did not beat them up—the "tough fighters" are the product of Hitler spirituality—but we snubbed them. The few harmless Jewish comrades were jailed, so to speak, into a spiritual-social ghetto. Later I became a rational anti-Semite, if the term is permissible, by the education I received in the *Verein deutscher Studenten.* . . .

The only student organizations, which in the 1890's engaged in politics, were the *Verein deutscher Studenten* on the right and the *Freie Wissenschaftliche Vereinigung* on the left. For me, as *Junker,* of course, only the organization on the right counted. . . .

The *Verein deutscher Studenten* was anti-Semitic because Jewry was considered un-German—race theory; unpatriotic—the Jews stood almost without exception in the camp of the opposition; and asocial—they were believed to be the pillars of Manchesterism. Court Chaplain Stoecker and Professor Heinrich von Treitschke were the two gods of the *Verein deutscher Studenten.* . . .

The main reason for the anti-Semitism of my first thirty years of life was that I hardly knew a Jew. Why should I bother with the representatives of an inferior race? Especially since these people ranked below par morally,

* Gerlach, Hellmut von: *Von Rechts Nach Links, loc. cit.,* pp. 108-110, 115.

but unfortunately above par intellectually so that one was apt to lose out in contact with them. Was not all the power of this so numerically limited alien tribe based on this combination of shrewdness and moral unscrupulousness?

That is what I heard daily in the *Verein deutscher Studenten*, in my own social group, and in the anti-Semitic meetings, but above all from the right-wing press—"Jewish sheets," of course, I would not touch. The literature that was read in our circles made its contribution. For me, who hardly knew a single Jew, the image of Jewry was all the more firmly fixed: a people of crassest materialism, only out to make money, shirking hard work, unproductive, exclusively devoted to trade, unprincipled as to the means employed and therefore especially strongly represented in the statistics of crime; destructive by inclination, cynical, lewd—all in all Mephistopheles incarnate in a people.

[Gerlach did not remain an anti-Semite. He attributed his change of mind to personal experience, reason, and taste. Heinrich Heine, Karl Marx, Eduard Bernstein are among the men of Jewish descent whose intellectual or artistic achievements impressed him. So did the civic-consciousness and social-mindedness of prominent Jewish families. Finally, the mediocrity of the anti-Semitic leadership repelled him to such a degree that, as he declared, the anti-Semites cured him of anti-Semitism more quickly than the Jews.]

b. THE RACIST*

The impulse came from a pamphlet which I found in my parents' home. One of my brothers, ten years older than I, had brought it home. Locked in the privy (*auf verschwiegenem Örtchen*) I started to read and stumbled over a sentence: "The Aryan and the Semite represent two inassimilable contrasts, like fire and water." It was a pamphlet of the national youth organization, united in the *Wartburgbund*, since 1899 *Jungdeutscher Bund.*

That Semite stood for the Jew I knew. But the Aryan gave me a headache. Gradually by my asking around, the fog lifted. However, I only grasped later why the Aryan should be the complete opposite of the Semite. It is true, already then, we boys did not like the Jew, we disliked him emotionally and put up with Jewish classmates only when we were forced to.

Finally, but not least important, a present from my mother contributed to my aversion; she put O. Glaubrecht's novel *Das Volk und seine Treiber* (The People and Its Drivers) under the Christmas tree for me. . . . This novel appeared in the first third of the nineteenth century and is, just as Polenz' novel, *Der Büttnerbauer*, excellently suited to enlighten the German people as to the foreign attitude of the Jew and his injurious activities.

Around 1893 I became more fully aware of the Semitic way and its Aryan opposite. My mother had sent me to Gutschow in the southern part of Friedrichstrasse to get some flour. In one of these buildings there was housed Dewald's Anti-Semitic Book Store. It exhibited Jewish caricatures, anti-Semitic newspapers, and other related writings. Attracted by the pictures I

* Willi Buch, "Wie ich Antisemit wurde," *50 Jahre antisemitische Bewegung, loc. cit.*, pp. 28 ff.

read everything my eyes could reach, from the first to the last letter. One periodical especially caught my fancy; it carried the queer title *Personalist und Emanzipator*. I am sure that at least nine-tenths of its title and contents were incomprehensible to me at the time, but the publication intrigued me sufficiently to make me trudge from now on once a week from Bülowstrasse in the west to Friedrichstrasse and to read the periodical and everything else I could make out through the window pane.

Eagerly I bought the *Mitteilungen aus dem Verein des Antisemitismus** (Bulletin of the Society of Anti-Semitism) at the newsstands on Belle-Alliance Square and the corner of Bülow- and Potsdamer Streets. And, this may sound like a bad joke, but through this miserable sheet (*dieses elende Schandblatt*) I became a rabid anti-Semite in earliest boyhood and through this and other publications that I bought when I could afford them with the few pennies I was given, I gained a sizeable knowledge of the men who then were active in the anti-Semitic movement.

Besides, other Jewish newspapers like the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the *Freisinnige Zeitung* worked in the same direction as the philo-Semitic defense publications. The defense against anti-Semitism was so reckless, the attacks against its representatives so full of hate and obvious lies that their effect upon the sober and realistic German was mostly contrary to the intended one. They proved to be part of that power which schemes evil but creates the good.

Before long I started to spend my pocket money on subscriptions to anti-Semitic periodicals which I had sent to my parent's home address. First, of course, deceived by the title, *Das Freie Wort*, which came from a southwestern city. Then followed Dr. Boeckel's *Reichsherold*, Berlin, the *Deutsch Soziale Blätter*, Hamburg, the *Deutsche Reform*, Berlin, the *Sachsenschau*, Magdeburg, the *Unverfälschte Deutsche Worte* (Unadulterated German Words) which came from Vienna, the *Alldeutsche Tagblatt*, *Kikeriki*, the comic paper devoted to Lueger's cause, and similar periodicals. I kept changing the subscriptions and finally settled for the *Deutsche Reform* and the *Deutsch Soziale Blätter*. It so happened, however, that my father did not approve of them. He railed against "vile Jew-baiting" and forbade me to subscribe to them. When I did not cancel the subscription, he one day silently tore up the papers the letter carrier had brought. This outraged my boyish heart and I dared say something about tampering with the mail. Well, inconsiderate as fathers are at times, he hit me on my insolent mouth and for days afterwards my ears were burning.

Not that it helped, for now I claimed my mail at General Delivery. There, at the post office West 57, I had a fellow reader. Many a time I caught the postal clerk reading my papers. I did not mind it at all as I hoped to see him thus also converted to anti-Semitism. Benevolently he then always handed me the newly arrived shipment.

[Buch remained an anti-Semite throughout his life. Later experiences only confirmed the convictions he had acquired at the age of ten!]

* Apparently a publication which attempted to fight anti-Semitism by ridiculing it.

DOCUMENT NO. IX

*A Private Letter of Friedrich Engels**

. . . However, I must ask you to consider whether you will not do more harm than good through anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is a characteristic feature of a backward culture and can be found therefore only in Prussia, Austria, and Russia. He who would try to practice anti-Semitism here in England or in America would be laughed at, and M. Drumont in Paris creates with his writings—which are infinitely superior to those of the German anti-Semites —only a minor, ineffective one-day sensation. Moreover, now that he has become a candidate for the city council he is forced to admit that he is against Christian capital just as much as against Jewish! And M. Drumont would be read even of he advocated the opposite opinion.

In Prussia, it is the low nobility, the *Junkers,* who earn 10,000 marks and spend 20,000 and therefore fall prey to the usurers, who go in for anti-Semitism; and in Prussia and Austria it is the petty bourgeois, doomed to extinction by the competition of big capital, the craftsman and small businessman, who join the chorus. However, in so far as capital ruins *these* classes of society, which are reactionary through and through, it fulfills its mission and is useful, whether it be Semitic or Aryan, circumcised or baptized; it helps the backward Prussians and Austrians advance to the modern point of view where all old social differentiations dissolve in the one great conflict between capitalists and workers. Where this point has not yet been reached, where no strong capitalistic class exists *yet,* and therefore no strong working class, where capital is still too weak to take possession of the entire national production, and where the stock exchange is the main arena of its activity; where production is still in the hands of the peasants, the landowners, the craftsmen and similar classes, taken over from the Middle Ages—only there is capital predominantly Jewish, and only there does anti-Semitism thrive.

In all North America with its millionaires whose wealth can be hardly expressed in our shabby marks, florins, or francs, there is *not a single Jew* among those millionaires, and the Rothschilds are real beggars compared to

* On May 9, 1890, the Social Democratic *Arbeiter-Zeitung* of Vienna published these parts of a letter by Friederich Engels, with the following note: "Surely, we do not have to mention explicitly that we reprint this letter with the approval of the sender as well as of the receiver." It is not clear to whom the letter was addressed. Although included in the collection of Victor Adler's articles, speeches and letters which the governing body of the Austrian Social Democratic Party published in honor of its leader, the letter was not addressed to Adler. We quote from *Victor Adlers Aufsätze, Reden und Briefe* (Vienna, 1922), pp. 6-8.

those Americans. And even here in England Rothschild is a man of modest means compared, for instance, with the Duke of Westminster. Even on the Rhine, where, 95 years ago, with the assistance of the French, we chased the aristocrats out of the country and have created a modern industry, where are the Jews?

Thus, anti-Semitism is nothing but a reactionary movement of decaying, medieval, social groups against modern society, which is essentially composed of capitalists and workers, and therefore anti-Semitism serves only reactionary purposes underneath its socialistic disguise; it is a variety of feudal socialism, from which we must stay away. If it can thrive at all in a country, it is only proof that not enough capitalism exists in that country. Today capitalism and labor are inseparable. As capitalism grows stronger so does labor. Therefore, I wish us Germans—and I count the Viennese among them—a rapid development of capitalism, and certainly not its stagnation.

Moreover, anti-Semitism distorts the entire picture. The anti-Semites do not even know the Jews against whom they howl; otherwise they would know that here in England and in America—thanks to the anti-Semites from eastern Europe—and in Turkey—thanks to the Spanish Inquisition—there are thousands and thousands of *Jewish proletarians*; and as a matter of fact, these Jewish workers are the most exploited and the most miserable ones. Here in England we have had *three* strikes of Jewish workers during the last twelve months, and then we are supposed to practice anti-Semitism in the struggle against capital?

In addition, we owe a great deal to Jews. Not to mention Heine and Börne, Marx was of purely Jewish origin; Lassalle was a Jew. Many of our best people are Jews. My friend Victor Adler, who is now paying in a prison in Vienna for his devotion to the cause of the proletariat; Eduard Bernstein, the editor of the London *Sozialdemokrat*, Paul Singer, one of our best men in the Reichstag—people of whose friendship I am proud, and all of them Jews! I myself was made a Jew by the [conservative weekly] *Gartenlaube*. To be sure, if I had to choose, then rather a Jew than "Herr *von*"! . . .

Friedrich Engels

London, April 19, 1890.

DOCUMENT NO. X

On the Intellectual History of Franz Mehring

Mehring's development illustrates the impact of the revolutionary theory on the evaluation of political anti-Semitism. The pre-Marxist Mehring saw in Stoecker a miserable and dangerous demagogue. Mehring the Marxist appraised Stoecker as almost a second Luther. The early Mehring feared the effects anti-Jewish rabble-rousing might have on the Jewish group. Later, Mehring no longer believed that there was a Jewish problem; nor that anti-Semitism was actually directed against the Jews. The phenomenon interested him exclusively as a manifestation of the class struggle.

a. THE HUMANITARIAN CONSERVATIVE*

In the Germany of the 1870's, Mehring believed, a genuine Jewish question existed, as did a movement of popular anti-Semitism. However, it had not, as he explains, been created by Stoecker.

"To charge him with such a thing would be to give far too much credit to this miserable demagogue. All he did was to poison this question as he has attempted with all his might to poison and inflame all our public life. The Jewish question was bound to arise of its own accord, especially in Berlin, and there was nothing anyone could do about it. In Berlin the Jewish element between 1780 and 1880 became an important and inseparable part of the population, just as the French colony had become between 1680 and 1780. As long as a hundred years ago, the good and bad elements of Jewry formed a sharp contrast. On the one side were ranged Lessing's friends Herz and Mendelssohn, on the other the money-changer Jews Ephraim and Itzig. In the same characteristic way the Jewish scholars of our universities today face our Jewish stockbrokers. The grandeur and misery of Berlin's history in the last century are unthinkable without the traces Jewry has left on each of its pages. But throughout this long period the alien, unpleasant or at least unaccustomed features of the Jewish character never impressed themselves so painfully on the great majority of Berlin's population as during the last ten years. This is said neither by way of indictment nor even of complaint: the phenomenon is so perfectly normal that it would be astonishing if it had *not* occurred. When the dikes were breached that since time immemorial had forced a strong and deep stream into an unnaturally narrow channel, an inundation

* Mehring, Franz; *Herr Hofprediger Stoecker der Sozialpolitiker* (Bremen, 1882), pp. 64–69, 75–76.

was bound to happen. And a gifted, shrewd, tough-fibered race that has been suffering for hundreds and even thousands of years under despotic oppression will, at the moment of liberation, develop an expansive and explosive force which is hard to imagine for anyone who has not seen it with his own eyes. It will generate this power all the more readily when it has been able to acquire, despite all oppression, the mightiest weapon of our time [money], and when it has ample opportunity to advance with this conquering sword.

"This was the particular situation at the beginning of the 1870's. Victory, so long hoped for and finally won, intoxicated the Jews, and when in the full flush, one is anything but modest and sensible, thoughtful and cautious. In those days the more mischievous elements among Berlin's Jews participated, in an abnormally high proportion, in bogus stock and stock-company swindles. Jewish writers and speakers delighted in criticizing the internal state of affairs of our Christian churches—and frequently with an effrontery that was in inverse proportion to the understanding their criticism revealed. Each day produced new evidence of that strange lack of *verecundia* which Schopenhauer rightly or wrongly imputes to the Jewish people. As a result, there arose among the cultured groups of Berlin society, irrespective of political, religious and social beliefs, a deep animosity against the Jewish character. Whoever denies this has either not spent the last ten years in Berlin or disputes the truth.

"It was a serious political obligation to bring into the open the hatred that was smoldering under the ashes, before its invisible ravages had affected the noblest parts of our national organism. To have done this, and in the only dignified manner possible, namely with manly frankness and scientific seriousness, is the great and unforgettable contribution of Treitschke. This patriotic deed did not only meet objective opposition, often from equally honorable motives—I mention only Cohen's* high-minded, serious rebuttal; it also had to suffer the most disgusting vilification. This was a wretched attempt at intellectual terrorism (*Gesinnungsterror*), all the more contemptible since it tried to sail under a 'liberal' flag and usually originated with people who for their part made the most extensive, not to say intemperate, use of the right of free speech. It is an ironic fact that one may publicly speak and write about God and the world, about Church and State, about everything twixt heaven and earth—except the contemporary effects of Jewish emancipation, or rather its bad effects. For enthusiastic praise of its good effects is considered the highest flower of 'liberalism' in those circles. Some of these people seem to believe in good faith that, once the civil emancipation of the Jews has been written into our laws, the historical concept and the historical fact of Judaism had thereby ceased to exist and that it would be a grave mistake to revive them. These worthies manifest such a complete lack of historical and political sense that they have not the slightest claim to be heard publicly. After all, the success that attended Treitschke's pluck is the most telling justification for his action. For who can deny that a good many Jewish vulgarities

* The neo-Kantian philosopher Hermann Cohen replied to Treitschke's attack in *Ein Bekenntnis in der Judenfrage* (Berlin, 1880).

and ill-manners no longer flourish in our national life today as they did even two years ago. . . ."

Mehring then quotes from the writings of an anonymous Jewish author "*Was müssen wir Juden tun?*" to show the concern of "an intellectual and informed" Jew with the Jews' own responsibilities.

"That serious and patriotic Jews speak today in such a way, that a broad basis for understanding is thus being gained on which the painful question may gradually be brought to a settlement—that is Treitschke's merit which cannot be overestimated. The fortunate turn toward clarification which the situation has taken becomes clear when one thinks of certain events of the last years: on the one hand the League of Anti-Semites, the Petition of the Anti-Semites, and similar horseplay (*Bierulk*); on the other hand the mania for denunciation and chastisement; the eternal cry for the police whenever a drastic word against the Jews was uttered; the raising of every insignificant street brawl to the level of a treasonable act against Crown and State; the malicious gloating when veritable conspiracies deprived of their livelihoods people who were suspected of anti-Jewish feelings; the way personalities who by the simplest principles of constitutional law should stand above political conflicts were endlessly dragged into the feuds of the day; the irresponsible exploitation of the Pomeranian riots*—enough, all these ugly events which the liberal parties will unfortunately never be able to brush off altogether from their coattails. (As for the anti-Jewish riots, I happened to be visiting my Pomeranian home when they occurred. I took care to look into the matter and can only say that the news about them was in part incredibly exaggerated, in part lies cut from whole cloth, and that in more than one little town the nuisance started only because so much ado had been made about the affair.)"

Mehring goes on to appraise the right and wrong methods of dealing with the stiuation, sharply taking issue with the anti-and philo-Semitic scandal sheets (*Schandblätter*) "which represent only the opposite poles of the same lack of intellectual and ethical integrity," and then returns to the attack on Stoecker.

"When Herr Stoecker began to strike up this particular tune he discovered to his joy that he was at last able to fill a hall. Such a success, as everyone knows, goes to the heads of demagogues and clowns alike. The tiger had tasted blood. Within two years the Jewish question became the core of 'Christian Social' agitation and Herr Stoecker finally achieved what he had been unable to gain through either the real or the fictitious content of the Christian Social program: a certain power over the Berlin masses. The Jewish question, as now treated by him, took on quite a different appearance. For it is evidently one thing to analyze the Jewish question as a contemporary phenomenon under scientific, historical, psychological, social aspects; and another to make it the substance of political party strategy, of political mass agitation, carrying it as an immediate issue into groups who can react to it only emotionally and not with reason. Any half-way responsible agitator will resort to such a step only under the pressure of extreme necessity. For the danger

* Incidents of violence against Jewish property and life.

of 'unleashing the beast' is nowhere greater than here. The Jewish question brings into play the three most potent sources of hatred known in history: a religious, a racial, and a class conflict. The inherent dangers are made infinitely greater because of the fact that the Jewish question in Germany no longer really permits of a solution through legislation, the apparent goal of anti-Semitic party agitation. For the crux of the problem lies in the fact that the fusion of Teutonic and Semitic elements has not progressed far enough and at the same time already too far—not far enough to eliminate sharp friction and too far to allow a line of demarcation to be drawn that would be politically recognizable and definable by law; we suffer from the discomforts of such a transitional period. These aspects of the problem ought to give pause to every agitator who has preserved even the faintest sense of political responsibility, before he makes the Jewish question the cornerstone of a mass movement. . . ."

Mehring then attacks Stoecker for the ambiguity of his criticism of the Jews and for failing to state clearly what he proposes to do in order to remedy the situation.

"Side by side with a good many defects in modern Jewry it is perhaps its highest glory that there is today not one person of culture in Germany who is not linked in intimate relations of heart and intellect with one or more Jews. It is from their outlook that Stoecker's anti-Jewish agitation is so unspeakably depressing. Hearing this wretched fanatic, eyes piously raised, mouth drooling with unction, make his incendiary speeches against the Jews until the mob, goaded into a frenzy by demagogic tricks, breaks out into the howling cry 'To the stake with the Jews!'—no man of feeling can think without the deepest pangs of those many honorable and high-minded fellow citizens who, hurt to the quick, must become obsessed by the devilish thought that their life and work among the German people, the best and deepest part of their earthly existence, is after all nothing but a snare and a delusion."

b. THE THEORETICIAN OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE*

"It is almost exactly eight years since that tempest in a teapot, the campaign of vilification against Stoecker, reached its climax in the liberal press.† He was then Chaplain to the Court, and he withstood this storm, as he subsequently did many others, as the bold and God-fearing man that he was. Little did he dream then that less than a decade later the howling mob of his own followers was to rage over him, mercilessly trampling their erstwhile leader. We now bear daily witness to this unhappy process of destruction,‡ and whatever Herr Stoecker's future in Church and State, his career as a demagogue is over for good and all.

* Mehring, Franz: *"Das Ende eines Demagogen," Neue Zeit,* vol. XI, 2 (1892-3), pp. 545, ff.

† Reference to public reaction to Stoecker's court suit in 1885 which boomeranged.

‡ Reference to the violent opposition Stoecker received from Ahlwardt's racial anti-Semites.

"Yet the demagogue in him was his better part, for despite everything he was one of the better demagogues. He was endowed with native wit, the gift of ready repartee, quickness of thought, an indestructible good humor that helped him over the roughest spots, and an unshakable belief, less in his cause, than in himself. He was by no means the mendacious fellow the liberal press sought to make him out. Prevarication in the cowardly and contemptible sense of the word was quite alien to him. He did, however, have that happy-go-lucky carelessness in asserting and retracting facts that is of the essence of the demagogue. It was this aspect of his character that was exploited to the utmost by the hired scribblers of moneyed Jewry to present Stoecker as a scarecrow of untruthfulness. His admirers came much closer to the truth when they celebrated him as a 'second Luther.' Much in Stoecker, good and bad, recalls Luther—but with a slight difference. Stoecker lacked what made Luther a historic personage—the revolutionary period in his life. And this difference may perhaps be reduced to another. Luther was born the son of a proletarian; Stoecker of a Royal Prussian sergeant in the Halberstadt Cuirassiers.

"The so-called petty bureaucracy, military and civil, is among the most solid props of reaction, as embodied in the Prussian State. By social position, by its pitifully poor living standards and frugal mode of life, it belongs to the masses. Actually it is not only aloof from them, but in sharp hostility to them, by virtue of its many privileges which, while they do not fill its belly, make it into a collection of vest-pocket despots over the population that has nothing. In Prussia the poor man may come into his right before God, but never before the policeman. The subalterns, on their part, are slavishly submissive to the officials in the upper brackets before whom they dare not even bat an eye on pain of instant dismissal; on the other hand, while the way into high office and honor is closed to themselves, it is open to their offspring. This is one of the main sources of the vitality which the fossil ruin of the Prussian mandarin system has still managed to retain in the modern world. The whole social background of the petty bureaucracy makes it inevitable that its second generation partakes of a goodly portion of proletarian strength and proletarian defiance—in other words, a considerable creative potential. But these young people are suckled on contempt for the masses, and their sense of proletarian solidarity is at the outset adulterated into that 'proletarian' ambition that seeks to match in abuse of those of lower position the arbitrary treatment their own class suffers at the hands of higher officialdom. Any glance at the history of higher Prussian officialdom will show that its best minds stem chiefly from the families of the petty bureaucrats, from which the bourgeois liberal, to say nothing of the proletarian revolutionary, movement gains virtually no recruits. At least not until now, for in recent years social ferment has managed to penetrate even into the ranks of Prussia's petty bureaucracy.

"Once this social background from which Stoecker rose is understood, it is also clear why he became a 'second Luther,' but only at the expense of all that made Luther what he was. Stoecker started out by betraying the proletariat—a betrayal into which Luther, after revolutionary beginnings, was pushed only by the force of history and not without vehement resistance.

Stoecker's ambition was limited to rising from the ranks of the oppressed into the oppressor class as quickly as possible. And he succeeded with surprising speed. While still at a relatively tender age, he was appointed to the influential Court chaplaincy in Berlin. To be sure, chance was partly responsible—that chance, which in the wise words of Albert Lange always plays its part in the lives of meteoric upstarts. Stoecker married money, which freed his energies for 'politics on a higher plane,' to use his own term. As Divisional Chaplain in Metz he attracted the attention of Field Marshal Manteuffel, who was shrewd enough to see that the man might be useful and commended him to the aged Emperor Wilhelm. Yet undoubtedly Stoecker also owed his brilliant career largely to a native endowment that distinguished him from his kind; or, to our way of thinking, to the rugged capacity for defiance his proletarian origins had given him.

"For Stoecker was never a climber and sycophant in the ordinary sense. This merit can hardly be denied the man whose expulsion from Berlin was at one time seriously considered when martial law was imposed. His rigid orthodox faith springs precisely from his rigid character traits. For under Bismarck orthodoxy was not living on the fat of the land, and men who craved the good things of life were poorly advised, in the seventies, to flirt with traditional Catholicism or organized Protestantism. Indeed, Stoecker's first public appearance was a bold move against Bismarck. A week to the day after Bismarck had bargained with Bennigsen in Varzin about forming a National Liberal cabinet, Stoecker, in January, 1878, opened his campaign against Social Democracy, specifically against the Social Democratic movement as the offspring of liberalism. It was a shrewd gamble on the sentiments and convictions of the octogenarian Emperor, and how well it paid off, how deeply the Emperor was infused with the significance of that important affair of state, is shown in the recently published letters he wrote to Roon on the subject. Since that day Stoecker was the old Emperor's fair-haired boy, whom even Bismarck could never unseat—though the Emperor's favor applied only to Stoecker's person. On the political side, the dubious attempt [upon the Emperor's life] by the imbecile Hödel, coming a few months after the onset of the Christian Social agitation and at a time, by the way, most welcome to Bismarck, showed the Prussian leadership that only *Junker* brutality rather than religious unction could be depended on to 'destroy' socialism.

"But if Stoecker was no climber and sycophant in the current sense, neither did his whole development stamp him as a man to pursue a policy independent of the interests of the exploiting and oppressing classes. No sooner had the anti-Socialist laws cleared the way for the impoverishment of the masses à la Bismarck, when Stoecker quickly trimmed his sails to the new wind. Perhaps his vilest demagogic trick occurred on November 22, 1880, in the Prussian Diet when he declared that Bismarck's 'protective tariff' was identical with what he had demanded in his Christian Social program as 'workers' protection,' had expressly elaborated as abolition of work on Sunday, introduction of the standard work day, etc. This dangerous mischief was meliorated only by the fact that Stoecker's Christian Social program had

never received the slightest notice from the working class. It was one of the lucky chances in his career that in his attack on Social Democracy he ran smack into Most, who became embroiled in a spectacular duel of oratory with him. But the leadership of the Social Democratic Party then in office, and the good sense of the German workers made short shrift of the matter. As early as the elections of 1878 the utter failure of Christian Social agitation was revealed. The three candidates it ran in Berlin polled less than 1,500 combined votes. Though Stoecker was finally granted the boon of putting on his farce about the identity of 'workers' protection' and 'protective tariff' before the enlightened statesmen of the Prussian Chamber of Deputies, he knew full well that he could not fool the workers with this brazen fraud. Consequently, he threw himself into his anti-Semitic agitation.

"Today we need not fear that we shall be misunderstood when we say that here, too, he proved to have a certain proletarian instinct. In the late seventies and deep into the eighties the anti-Semitic movement presented a wholly senseless and undisciplined picture. It seemed like a furious outburst on the part of those who had drawn the short end of the bargain against those shrewd enough to beat them, a cheap joke no one was bold enough to credit with a future. To see in it a historic symptom of permanent social disfranchisement at least requires a little more social and political sense than to rant about the 'shame of the century.' It is to this relative superiority that Stoecker owed the fact that he emerged with equanimity from the ceaseless torrents of moral and political indignation that poured in upon him. He had the good fortune to watch the hatred of his opponents transcend all the bounds of reason, and it was not without skill that he exploited this advantage. He had the good fortune to arouse Bismarck's displeasure—Bismarck who was far too seasoned and sturdy an exploiter himself to look upon even partial opposition to Jewish capital as anything but a heinous assault on the sacredness of exploitation itself. He had the good fortune, finally, to find foils in other anti-Semitic demagogues—of whom the sober sycophant Adolph Wagner was not the least—against whom he stood out sharply.

"But even in this agitation he found no cause to hold aloof from the interests of the ruling classes. He could never tell the ruined peasants and petty bourgeois: It is bourgeois society that is the cause of your decline, nor is there any salvation for you in such a society. Indeed, he could not even propose to the sinking petty bourgeoisie a single palliative nostrum that might have cut into the body of feudal and capitalist exploitation. The more clarity the anti-Semitic movement attained about its own nature, the more did the agitation of its leader degenerate into idle and senseless prating. Stoecker's sense of insecurity became plain when the Court Chaplain appealed to the courts for protection against the reverses the demagogue could no longer fend off. These unworthy tactics met their deserved reward when Emperor Friedrich, whom he had bitterly insulted, refused during his hundred days' reign to have him disciplined, denying him the cheap glory of the martyr that might have revived his political prestige for some time.* The most grievous

* Cf. our interpretation, Chapter IV, p. 56.

blow of all was inflicted by Stoecker on himself when the new policy confronted him with the choice of surrendering either his office or his anti-Jewish agitation. He frantically clung to his office. The 'second Luther' could not do otherwise.* It was not long before he was thrown out of office, unsung and unlamented as he deserved to be. The more the anti-Semitic movement stood revealed as the social rebellion of the petty bourgeoisie, the more rapid became Stoecker's decline. . . .

"Those who today draw and quarter him are his disciples and pupils. They are no whit better than he, perhaps a whole lot worse—at best cheaters cheated. Herr Stoecker is quite right in looking down with contempt on these 'oafs' (*Fatzkes*), as he tastefully calls them. He reveals one more flash of his proletarian origins when he proclaims Social Democracy the true heir of the anti-Semitic agitation. The *Kölnische Volkszeitung* sees in this a 'curious agreement' between Herr Stoecker and the *Neue Zeit*. Why 'curious'? A bad conscience is a powerful pair of glasses through which even Herr Stoecker may come to see what we have long since recognized in the light of socialist knowledge."

* Reference to Luther's famous statement before the Diet in Worms: "*Hier stehe ich. Ich kann nicht anders.*"

DOCUMENT NO. XI

The Marxist Appraisal of Zionism

A REVIEW OF THEODOR HERZL'S *Der Judenstaat**

A droll project, just as utopian as Theodor Hertzka's bankrupt Free-Land (*Freiland*) and conceived in the same spirit of negative courage. Struggle must be avoided; there the struggle of class and here of race. The latter, by the way, is only the mask for a special and reactionary form of class struggle, petty bourgeois-corporative and feudal-clerical. On this behalf the feuilletonist Th. Herzl publishes an appeal for the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine or Argentina. He expounds the details of his plan in this booklet. According to the newspapers he has already held a meeting at the London Society, "Maccabaeus," to promote his idea, but with very little success. The Jewish capitalists will be careful not to be taken in. They know only too well that anti-Semitism would follow them into the new Jewish State; of course, it then would drop the name and character of the 'socialism of the dolt' and appear as the unadulterated and unmasked struggle of the exploited masses against their exploiters. (How little racial and tribal kinship and community of religion prevent Jewish capitalists from exploiting Jewish proletarians, could be witnessed again at the International Socialist Congress a short time ago.) [The Jewish capitalists] would much rather stay in civilized countries where "the strong power of the state" holds its protective aegis over them. Incidentally, it is a pity that the poet Robert Hamerling did not live to learn of his compatriot's project; it surely would have given him some piquant material for a few additional touches in the eighth song of his satirical epos, "Homunculus," which deals with a similar Jewish State.

* J[akob], S[tern]: "Theodor Herzl, *Der Judenstaat. Versuch einer modernen Lösung der Judenfrage,*" *Neue Zeit,* Vol. XV, i (1896–97), p. 186.

DOCUMENT NO. XII

*A Jewish Socialist on Jews and German Social Democracy**

Widely varying opinions exist concerning the role of the Jews in the German Social Democratic Party. In the anti-Semitic press one finds the statement that Social Democracy is a Jewish invention and, behind the scenes, is run by Jews; that Jews are the hidden wire-pullers of the party. At times, one can also hear the opposite opinion: that the Social Democratic workers have discovered the Jew to be the exploiter and are, therefore, trying to rid the party of Jewish influence. Zionists and those similarly minded also often speak of an anti-Semitic tendency in the Social Democratic Party.

It is not necessary to say much about the ridiculous legend that the Social Democratic Party is a Jewish invention. The legend stems from the fact that the two greatest spiritual leaders of German Social Democracy, Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle, were of Jewish origin. But even before Marx and Lassalle, there were radical socialists in Germany. . . . Moreover, before the party was organized in Germany, both England and France had socialist movements in neither of which Jews played a prominent part.

The legend that the Jews are the inventors of German Social Democracy is childish. Nevertheless there is a problem tied up with the personalities of Marx and Lassalle, namely, how these two men have influenced the attitude of the German Social Democratic Party toward Jews and the Jewish question.

Both Marx and Lassalle unintentionally influenced the attitude of the Social Democratic Party in favor of the Jews. The mere fact that these two great men who stood up so wholeheartedly for the workers were of Jewish origin, must naturally have strengthened socialist opposition to anti-Semitism. The same fact also aided the spread of socialist propaganda among Jews. The writings of Marx and Lassalle about Jews, however, probably had an opposite effect.

There is a special treatment of the Jewish question by Marx, printed in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, 1844, under the title "On the Jewish Question," in which he discussed Bruno Bauer's two tracts on the same subject. As in all of Marx's work, there is much that is deep and inspiring but the treatment of the main theme is unsatisfactory. In this analysis more than in his other works Marx is influenced by the Hegelian method of drawing

* Bernstein, Eduard: "Jews and German Social Democracy," translated from the Yiddish, *Die Tukunft*, vol. XXVI (New York, March, 1921), pp. 145 ff.

general conclusions. He considered the Jews a nation composed entirely of traders; therefore he favored postponement of the question of equal rights for Jews, then a vital question in Germany, until the coming socialist revolution which would eliminate trade. . . .

The article elaborates on the theme that the Jew is the embodiment of egoism and that his faith is that of a money-minded person. It states: "The ideal which is found in the Jewish faith: the dislike of science, of art, of human history as a goal in itself, is truly the well-known position of the money-minded person." In brief, the Jewish money-minded person is the average Jew. This statement of Marx's was not applicable to the Jews of Western Europe, still less to those of Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, it was useful to the anti-Semites, and Socialists with anti-Semitic leanings accepted the interpretation. Among other things this is what happened to W[ilhelm] Hasselmann, the editor of the Lassallean wing. For a long time there was a noticeable tendency in the literature of the party to show that the capitalist and the Jew were synonymous.

Ferdinand Lassalle, from whose diary we know that in his youth he was enthusiastic about Jews, in his later years displayed a very unfriendly attitude toward Jews whenever he wrote about them. His most able pupil, J. B. Schweitzer went even further. In his socialist novel *Lucinde*, which appeared in Russian under the title *Emma*, the Jewish banker appears as the embodiment of the exploitation and betrayal of the common people. Also, in his dramatic work, *Die Schwalbe*, the evil manufacturer is a Jew. In this respect, Hasselmann, Schweitzer's pupil, excelled his teacher. After 1871, in the *Neue Socialdemokrat* which he edited very ably, the Jew and the exploiter were identified at every possible opportunity. And although Hasselmann was strongly opposed to Marx, he couldn't resist the temptation to reprint the above-quoted article in order to prove the correctness of his own opinions about Jews. Had Marx seen this article, he would undoubtedly have opposed it because his article had been written for an educated public which could be trusted to see the sociological implications: that the capitalistic nature of society had historically imbued the Jews with these acquired characteristics. But Hasselmann's paper was mainly circulated among poorly educated workers. . . . He often used the people's naive dislike of Jews as propaganda against a political opponent regardless of whether he belonged to one of the bourgeois parties or to the socialists. It is a well-known fact that the *Neue Socialdemokrat* derisively designated the Social Democrats of the Eisenach program [the party of Bebel and Liebknecht] "the thirteen Jews of Mühlendamm," because they had a fairly large number of Jewish members. Mühlendamm was then the home of the Jewish trade in second-hand goods and there used to be constant bickering about prices between the Jews and the passers-by to whom they sold their wares. They were considered of low moral character and were therefore heartily disliked.

Despite such anti-Jewish propaganda, there was no lack of Jewish members among the Lassalleans. . . . Even after Lassalle's death the entrance of Jewish members into the party did not cease. When the movement split in 1869,

most Jews went over to the opposition and helped build the Social Democratic Workers' Party of the Eisenach program. It would be wrong to attribute this split to the stand taken by the old party on the Jewish question. At that time there was as yet no Jewish question in the modern sense of the word. It was the era of rising liberalism which opened continually increasing new possibilities of endeavor to the Jews. And those Jews who entered the Socialist party took a very philosophic attitude toward the anti-Jewish bias of Schweitzer's articles. The articles were directed against the bourgeoisie with whom the Jewish Socialists themselves had broken. The opposition arose over Schweitzer's dictatorial policies and his friendship with the Prussian conservatives. . . .

The first Socialist of Jewish origin to enter the Reichstag was the writer Max Kaiser, who was elected in 1878 from the Saxon district of Freiberg. . . . A characteristic example of his attitude is supplied by the following episode. Shortly after his election, a Jewish newspaper asked him for a photograph and biographical material in order to print a directory of the Jewish deputies in the Reichstag. To this request he replied that since he was elected as a Socialist and not a Jew, he must deprive himself of the honor of appearing in the directory. . . .

The second Socialist of Jewish origin to enter the Reichstag was the world-famous Paul Singer. He was, himself, a merchant and manufacturer and a member of the middle-class democratic group. He had joined the socialist group of the Eisenach persuasion and been on friendly terms with such leading Socialists as Bebel long before he openly embraced socialism in 1884. . . . In the Reichstag Singer at once became the man most hated by the reactionaries and when, in one of his speeches, he sharply criticized the dishonest policies of one of the Ministers, the latter took revenge and expelled him from Berlin under the provisions of the anti-Socialist law. This caused Singer heavy material losses. He had to leave the business which he had built up and developed. But for the Social Democratic Party it was a great gain because from then on he devoted himself to party activities. . . . In questions of tactics and politics, he belonged to the radical wing of the party, and he often appeared to be more to the left than Bebel. . . . He and three other party members were the first Socialists to enter the Berlin City Hall. In city administration his abilities showed in their full brilliance, which even his opponents finally recognized. In 1910, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his membership in the Berlin City Council, the bourgeois government sent a deputation to his home to express its thanks for his useful work.

His real greatness became evident in his private activities. In opposition to the city asylum, he established the Berlin Asylum for the Homeless, where the police had no control. The exemplary facilities and kindliness of the administration in his asylum were his pride and joy. . . . Although the anti-Semites slandered him outrageously, no one achieved such popularity among the Berlin masses as Paul Singer. In this respect he can be compared only with August Bebel. Singer's funeral was the most impressive Berlin had even seen.

Two other Socialists of Jewish extraction entered the Reichstag during the

last decade of the nineteenth century: the lawyer Arthur Stadthagen and the chemist and writer Emanuel Wurm. Stadthagen. . . . showed his solid knowledge and critical abilities in the commission which prepared the new codification of German civil law. . . . His book on labor law which went through many editions and is often cited is a very able work. . . . Emanuel Wurm lived to see the revolution and during the early months of the German Republic was Minister of Food. . . . With Karl Kautsky he became one of the editors of the party's weekly *Die Neue Zeit.* Like Paul Singer and Arthur Stadthagen, he was a member both of the Reichstag and the City Government. And he, too, was given the highest praise for his work in local government. . . .

A few more Social Democrats of Jewish origin must be mentioned who served in the Reichstag before the revolution: Max Cohen, Oscar Cohn, Georg Davidsohn, Georg Gradnauer, Hugo Haase, Josef Herzfeld, Gustav Hoch, Otto Landsberg, and the author of this article. Gradnauer and I were chiefly writers. Haase, Herzfeld, and Landsberg were lawyers. . . . Through his courageous attitude Oscar Cohn became known abroad. Gustav Hoch is little known abroad, but he was one of the most able and diligent members of the Social Democratic Reichstag group. . . . The high esteem in which Georg Gradnauer was held in Saxony can be seen from the fact that immediately upon the establishment of the Republic, he was elected Minister President. . . .

Of the eleven Jewish Social Democratic Reichstag members, seven—Cohn, Haase, Herzfeld, Hoch, Stadthagen, Wurm, and Bernstein—were opposed to the war budget. On the question of the war budget an oppositional minority developed in 1916 which called itself the Independent Social Democratic Party. Six of the above-mentioned, except Gustav Hoch, joined the opposition. . . . It has been said that when the six Jewish deputies left the group, one of the non-Jewish members called out: "Thank God! Now we are rid of the Jews!" I mention this because much was written about it at the time. Even if such a statement had really been made, it would not reflect on the attitude of the party toward the Jewish question. It only shows how strong the feeling of nationalism was among the German workers during the war. Friedrich Engels had predicted something like this during the eighties when he warned me not to think lightly of a war with Russia. A war between Germany and Russia, he wrote, would automatically draw in France on the side of Russia. Should Germany get into a war of national existence with France and Russia, the nationalistic passions would get hold of the workers. This would happen regardless of whether the Socialists wanted it. To many Social Democrats the war really seemed to be one for national existence; and to many passionate natures the opposition of so many Jews to the war credits might have seemed to betray un-German or anti-German thinking. How little such feeling had to do with anti-Semitism can be seen from the fact that those Jews who voted for the war loans were more highly esteemed and sought after than ever.

Moreover, one must not think that because seven of the Jewish Social Democrats in the Reichstag were opposed to the war credits and [only] four in favor, the same proportion prevailed among Jewish Social Democrats out-

side the Reichstag. Just the reverse was true. In the circle of the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, which included many Jews, I was for a long time the only one opposed to the granting of credits. Even I was not against the war credits until I had become convinced that the imperial governments of Berlin and Vienna were responsible for the war; that every attempt of the proletariat to protest against the war would be useless as long as the Social Democratic Party continued to vote the imperial government the means with which to carry it on. Such an attitude, unfortunately, was misunderstood by a great many of the German workers but it had nothing to do with a lack of interest in the fate of the German people.

With regard to the circle around the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, one must first speak of the periodical's editor, Dr. Josef Bloch. He is an exceptionally gifted East Prussian of Jewish origin. He is so Prussian-minded that at times he may be mistaken for a German nationalist. Before the war, he favored the defense and colonial policies of the German empire. To him, England was the power which German foreign policy must strive to conquer. During the war he was one of the most enthusiastic defenders of the war credits; today he is the guiding spirit among the socialist proponents of the so-called continental policy, that is, a policy which would tie together Germany, Russia, and France against England and, if necessary, also against the United States. This is not as a result of dislike of the English but because he believes that such a policy is necessary in the interest of Germany's world mission. As a Socialist he is a revisionist and as a Jew he is close to the Zionists.

Also in this group may be mentioned Bruno Borchardt, a City Councillor of Charlottenburg and division chief in the Ministry of Education; Max Cohen, who before the war was a member of the Reichstag and has since been a member of the Presidium of the Central Council of the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils in Germany; Julius Kaliski, a well-known journalist and authority on finance; and Vally Zepler, one of the most talented and devoted workers of the women's socialist movement. The group had a most unusual friend in the noted physicist Dr. Leo Arons who died a year ago. For years he supported the journal and even saw to it that after his death it would not get into financial difficulties. He is a descendant of a Berlin family of wealthy bankers. Even before he became a member of the Social Democratic Party, the Prussian government deprived him of the right to lecture in the Prussian universities. He devoted a large part of his fortune to socialist propaganda and to the aid of needy Socialists. As he was especially friendly to the trade union movement, he gave during the nineties a large sum of money for the building of the Berlin Trade Union House. This was the first large building in Berlin for the exclusive use of the workers. . . .

A third important organization for the Berlin workers was also built up and maintained as a result of the endeavors of a Socialist of Jewish extraction, Hugo Heimann. It is the Public Library and Reading Room which is outstanding for its literary treasures among similar institutions in Berlin. . . .

No profession is so well represented among the Jewish Social Democrats as medicine. If no Jewish physician has thus far been a Social Democratic repre-

sentative in the Reichstag, it is because there have been altogether few physicians in the Reichstag. However, many Social Democratic physicians of Jewish origin are found in municipal governments. In Berlin, one of the first was Dr. Ignaz Zadek, the brother of the late New York comrade Julia Zadek-Rome. Ignaz Zadek belonged to the Social Democratic Party for over forty years; he is one of those socialist students whom the anti-Socialist law against party activities could not frighten. . . . Zadek is responsible for the sanitary conditions of Berlin. During the nineties, when cholera spread through Germany, he organized the Workers' Sanitation Commission in Berlin, which was composed of public-minded workers and doctors. Its job was to uncover the unsanitary conditions of the tenements in the poorest sections, bring them to the attention of the proper officials, and propose plans for remedy. The Commission received eager cooperation from the workers. . . . Dr. Hermann Weil, who was then Chairman of the City Council of Greater Berlin and the leader of the non-partisan group in the Council belonged to it. Especially helpful to Zadek was . . . Dr. Alfred Blaschko, founder of the German Society to Combat Venereal Diseases and as a dermatologist well-known outside of Germany. . . .

Regarding the profession of teaching and writing, it is necessary to remember that before the [1918] revolution there were very few Jewish professors in Germany. Only those who were converted to Christianity and thus showed their political subservience, were invited to become professors. As a result, a Socialist of Jewish origin who became a professor was an exception to the rule. Such an exception was Emil Lederer, professor of economics at Heidelberg University, who in 1918 was chosen as a member of the Socialization Commission. Even before the war, the great mathematician Albert Einstein received an invitation from the then Royal Academy of Science in Berlin. His Judaism had to be accepted. The Berlin Academy could find no excuse for rejecting a man whom all authorities in his field had recognized as one of the greatest thinkers of his day. But Einstein is not only a Jew; he is also a Social Democrat. Recently the University of Frankfurt am Main honored Hugo Sinzheimer. For many years a jurist and active lawyer, he is a member of the Social Democratic majority and was, in January, 1919, elected to the National Assembly. . . . He was also a member of the committee investigating the conduct of the war. In this committee he showed unusual Jewish cleverness and sharp-wittedness. Among others, he and Oscar Cohn questioned the venerated generals, Hindenburg and Ludendorff, and were not overawed by them. This gave the German anti-Semites new opportunities for irrational attacks.

Until recently a similar situation [as in the universities] existed in the intermediate and secondary schools. Under the *Kaiserreich* the *Gymnasiums* were schools of ingrained nationalism; since the war they have been nests of dark anti-Semitism. The Social Democrat of Jewish origin who made teaching his career has until now been solely dependent upon the free workers' educational institutions and upon his writings.

In the list of Social Democratic writers and journalists we find a considerable number of persons of Jewish origin. From the days of the anti-Socialist law may be mentioned: Adolf Hepner, who was Liebknecht's coeditor on the

Volks-Staat; Karl Kirsch; Max Kaiser, who is mentioned above; Samuel Kakasky; and Maximilian Schlesinger. During the period of the anti-Socialist law, the author of these lines also became a professional writer and acted as editor of the Zürich *Socialdemokrat*. Somewhat later, Dr. Heinrich Braun started to edit the *Archiv für Soziale Gesetzgebung [und Statistik]* and the *Sozial-Politische Central-Blatt*. Also journalistically active were Moses Oppenheim and Reinhold and Bruno Schoenlank in Munich. Schoenlank was for a time editor of the Berlin *Vorwärts* and ended his career as editor in chief of the *Leipziger Volks-Zeitung*, which he helped to establish. He was a member of the Reichstag and for many years the leading political editor of *Vorwärts*.

Kurt Eisner, of Jewish extraction, was a writer with a broad philosophic and literary background, a talented poet and excellent stylist; as a politician he had the fortunate gift of being able to get at the core of a complicated situation. Nevertheless, his idealistic spirit led him into errors. His first decrees and speeches as Minister President of Bavaria were examples of far-seeing *Realpolitik*. But when, in opposition to the united middle-class parties, the workers, stirred up by Moscow, organized to convert Bavaria forcibly into a soviet republic on the bolshevist pattern, Eisner was no longer on solid ground. The assassin's bullet which killed him in March, 1919, rescued him from a very complicated situation.* A year earlier he had delivered a courageous speech against war. Fully knowing that the speech would put him in jail, he was willing to sacrifice his freedom to set an example to those who fought to end the war. It was he who made public the dispatch by Count Lerchenfeld which revealed the tragic double-dealing of Berlin and Vienna which led to the war.

Friedrich Stampfer, who during the war and today is the leading political editor of *Vorwärts* is likewise of Jewish origin. . . . His articles at the time when the German armies were crumbling and during the early days of the November Revolution made *Vorwärts* the most popular paper in Berlin. . . . He is strongly nationalist-minded and probably no one was more responsible than this "Jew" for the fact that the Socialists voted for the war budget in 1914.

Another writer of Jewish origin—Austrian-born—who had a great influence upon German Social Democracy was Dr. Rudolf Hilferding. He was the leading editor of *Die Freiheit*, the fighting organ of the Independent Social Democrats. Hilferding is the author of *Das Finanzkapital*, one of the most eminent economic works written from the Marxist point of view. Through this work he gained a position of such eminence in the academic world that he was elected to the Socialization Commission in 1918 and even the present coalition government of the [Weimar] Republic appointed him to the Economic Council. . . .

The gallery of writers and journalists of Jewish origin could be indefinitely increased by persons who are well above average. From this one should not conclude, as the anti-Semites do, that the Social Democratic press is controlled by Jews. There is not a particle of truth in this. It must not be forgotten that there are in Germany today at least two hundred daily Social Democratic

* The Bavarian Soviet Republic was announced only after Eisner's assassination.

newspapers which employ at least five hundred journalists and writers. Even if fifty of them were of Jewish origin, [the figure] would amount only to one-tenth. Statistics on this question do not exist because the party does not inquire into the ancestry of its members; besides, the Jewish Social Democrats pay little attention to their faith and generally give their religion as "unaffiliated" or "dissident." There are very few converted Jews among the Social Democrats, and those few were converted in their youth at the request of their parents or were converted before they became Social Democrats. Zionism does not have any strong adherents among the ranks of the German Social Democrats. Nevertheless, the increase of anti-Semitism in schools has increased the influence of Zionism and Jewish nationalism among the younger generation of Jewish Social Democrats.

The percentage of Jews as compared to non-Jews in the party can be seen at conferences and conventions. It is seldom that more than ten per cent of those present are Jews. Actually, the number of Jewish participants is even smaller. In the present Reichstag, eight or nine of the one hundred and thirteen majority* Socialists are of Jewish origin. Of the fifty-nine deputies belonging to the right wing of the Independent* Socialists, six are Jews; of the twenty-four deputies of the newly united left wing of the Independent Socialists and the Communists, only two are of Jewish origin.

This is a larger proportion than the number of Jews in the population at large. However, it is hardly necessary to point out that as a result of historical factors for which the Jews were not responsible, they are almost entirely city dwellers and engage in urban occupations. Since the members of the Social Democratic Party are largely city dwellers, it is logical that Jews should have joined the party in proportionately larger numbers than their ratio to the entire population. Besides, it would be undue modesty not to point out that because of certain historical facts, Jews are intellectually more alert and take a larger part in communal life than do the non-Jewish masses. This also helps to account for the larger percentage of Jews in the Social Democratic Party.

In the German Social Democratic Party an outspoken anti-Semite is an impossibility. Here and there in the party or in the socialist trade unions one finds a certain amount of anti-Jewish feeling but this does not affect the distribution of positions or privileges. I have belonged to the Social Democratic Party for almost fifty years and I know of no instance when a person was not chosen as a candidate for office or defeated [as candidate] for a party post because he was a Jew. The workers especially show themselves to be objective and interested only in whether the candidate is true to his principles and possesses the qualifications for the job. . . .

In spite of the fact that during the 1918 Revolution many Jews were appointed as Ministers and to other high posts, it must once more be stressed that it is stupid and wrong to speak of Jews dominating the Social Democratic

* In 1921, when this article was written, the old Social Democratic party was split between the moderate "majority" and the "Independent Social Democrats." In 1922, after the left wing had already in 1920 gone over to the Communists, the "Independent Social Democrats" reunited with the "majority."

Party. But in the Reichstag and its predecessor, the National Assembly, in the Landtag, the communal governments, and the party organizations, over ninety per cent of those elected to office are non-Jews. And it should be sufficient to mention just a few of the long list of non-Jewish leaders, like Gustav Bauer, Hermann Molkenbuhr, Hermann Müller, Philipp Scheidemann, Robert Schmidt, Rudolf Wissell of the Social Democratic majority; Rudolf Breitscheid, Wilhelm Dittmann, Hermann Jaeckel, Fritz Kuhnert, Georg Ledebour, and Louise Zietz of the Independent Socialists; and Emil Eichhorn, Adolf Hofmann, and Klara Zetkin of the Communist Party, in order to prove that these are people who take orders from no one. The Jews in the Social Democratic Party are not a cohesive group. There are as many differences of opinion among them as among the non-Jews. The Jewish influence in the party is that of individuals. The Jews in the party never acted as Jews, and there was never any reason to do so. In this respect, too, the Social Democratic Party showed itself as the party of equal rights for all, without discrimination as to origin or race. I do not believe that the non-Jewish members ever regretted it.